

# Contemporary Review

incorporating THE FORTNIGHTLY

No. 1108 APRIL 1958

Liberal Policy and Prospects	DR. NATHANIEL MICKLEM
Problems of France	W. L. MIDDLETON
The Irish Treaty Ports in 1938. Part II	SIR DOUGLAS SAVORY
Alexander the Great	DR. ERNST BENEDEKT
Revolt in Algeria	MARY R. BULL
The Second Empire. XV. The Mexican Fiasco	G. P. GOOCH, D.LITT., F.B.A.
Albert Camus	DEREK STANFORD
Impressions of Turkey	J. P. BURY
Myth and the Dream of Flying	J. C. GREGORY
Education and the Arts in Israel	DR. NORMAN BENTWICH
Albania in Chains	DR. JOSEPH S. ROUCEK
England's First Ambassador to Moscow	DENYS VAL BAKER
Nietzsche and the Nineties	DR. M. A. MORLAND
German Labour Relations	WILFRED ALTMAN
Bluebells— <i>A Poem</i>	JOHN BARRON MAYS

Literary Supplement—Contributors: George Glasgow, Dr. Frederick Hertz, Dr. Irene Marinoff, E. W. Martin, The Rev. B. C. Plowright, J. B. Coates, Theodora Roseoe, Dr. Vera J. Daniel, Grace Banyard.

Price 4/- 53/- per annum U.S.A. \$ 10.00

ALL CLASSES OF INSURANCE TRANSACTED  
**MOTOR UNION INSURANCE COMPANY LTD.**  
10, ST. JAMES'S STREET, LONDON, S.W.1



*Photo by Courtesy 'Sunday Times.'*

**The Rt. Hon. LORD HAILSHAM, Q.C.**

## **APPEALS FOR CANCER RESEARCH**

LORD HAILSHAM writes: "The Imperial Cancer Research Fund, which is under the highest medical and scientific direction, is continually engaged in the work of Cancer Research in its own modern laboratories. The work is now to be still further increased in new laboratories at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Very heavy expenditure is involved, and help is urgently needed from generous-hearted people to meet the cost. I hope, therefore, that the appeal may evoke a most generous response."

## **IMPERIAL CANCER RESEARCH FUND**

*Patron: Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen*

Please send a Gift to the Hon. Treasurer, A. Dickson Wright, Esq., F.R.C.S.,  
at Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.2.

## **The Liberal News speaks out for Liberalism**

There is nowhere else you can be sure of finding week by week a comprehensive record of the activity of the reviving Liberal Party and a broad platform for all that is most significant in developing Liberal opinion.

**Topical**

**Vigorous**

**Informative**

**THE ONLY ORGAN IN THE PRESS  
CONTROLLED BY THE PARTY**

*Every Friday*

*Fourpence*

# Contemporary Review

incorporating THE FORTNIGHTLY

*CONTRIBUTIONS* will be considered for publication and should be addressed to the Editor, *Contemporary Review*, 46 Chancery Lane, W.C.2, England.

*SUBSCRIPTIONS* are charged at the rate of 53s. per annum post free, or \$10.00 in the U.S. and Canada. A single copy costs 4s. (4s. 3d. including postage), \$1.00 in the U.S. and Canada. Orders may be placed with newsagents, booksellers or subscription agents, or may be sent direct with the appropriate remittance to the Circulation Manager, *Contemporary Review*, 46 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2, England.

*ADVERTISEMENTS.* Suitable advertisers' announcements are accepted for publication. Orders and advertisement copy should be received by the 15th of the month preceding the date of publication and should be addressed to the Advertisement Manager, *Contemporary Review*, 46 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2, England (Telephone Holborn 6201).

---

## LIST OF CONTENTS APRIL 1958

Liberal Policy and Prospects . . . . .	DR. NATHANIEL MICKLEM	170
Problems of France . . . . .	W. L. MIDDLETON	172
The Irish Treaty Ports in 1938. Part II . . . . .	SIR DOUGLAS SAVORY	177
Alexander the Great . . . . .	DR. ERNST BENEDIKT	181
Revolt in Algeria . . . . .	MARY R. BULL	184
The Second Empire. XV. The Mexican Fiasco . . . . .	G. P. GOOCH, D.LITT., F.B.A.	187
Albert Camus . . . . .	DEREK STANFORD	191
Impressions of Turkey . . . . .	J. P. BURY	195
Myth and the Dream of Flying . . . . .	J. C. GREGORY	197
Education and the Arts in Israel . . . . .	DR. NORMAN BENTWICH	201
Albania in Chains . . . . .	DR. JOSEPH S. ROUCEK	204
England's First Ambassador to Moscow . . . . .	DENYS VAL BAKER	207
Nietzsche and the Nineties . . . . .	DR. M. A. MORLAND	209
German Labour Relations . . . . .	WILFRED ALTMAN	212
Bluebells—A Poem . . . . .	JOHN BARRON MAYS	216

Literary Supplement—Contributors: George Glasgow, Dr. Frederick Hertz, Dr. Irene Marinoff, E. W. Martin, The Rev. B. C. Plowright, J. B. Coates, Theodora Roscoe, Dr. Vera J. Daniel, Grace Banyard.

---

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

46-47 CHANCERY LANE . LONDON W.C.2

## LIBERAL POLICY AND PROSPECTS

IT is natural that Liberals should be at the moment in good spirits. After Rochdale and some other by-elections they are once again taken seriously by the country and the other parties as a force in politics. Since 1955 they have fought 12 by-elections; they have received, I gather, some 117,000 votes, the Tories some 156,000 and the Socialists 174,000. The only certain result of these figures is that there are seven Tory M.P.s., five Socialist M.P.s., and the Liberals are unrepresented. How will Liberals fare when the General Election comes? The answer depends largely upon two things; first, their ability to put their policy in succinct and intelligible terms, second, the willingness of the electorate to vote positively for that in which it believes rather than negatively to keep someone out. It is perhaps a reasonable surmise that if the present Government would introduce some scheme of a transferable alternative vote Liberals might expect some 50 or 60 seats, and there would be considerably more Conservative members than now seems probable.

What of the further outlook? Will the Liberals ever again return to power? Not without some moral renascence of the British nation. As a people we are frustrated, divided, disillusioned. To maintain British prestige, to give everyone as good a time as possible, and to cushion all against any kind of trouble are the apparent political principles upon which we are governed. Without an honestly balanced Budget, without an honest and stable currency, without the will to work and to adventure, without a sense of this country's greatness and its continuing call to give a lead among the nations, we shall come very quickly to disaster. I still believe that the British people would respond to a great moral lead as it did in war-time when we stood alone. I cannot see that lead given by either of the larger parties. It is sad to reflect that with the coming of universal franchise together with new techniques of mass-influence, through the popular Press and television, Parliamentary Government is jeopardized even in its proud home. We have as yet had no British Péron, but one might well arise. We have yet to show that Plato and Aristotle were astray in their judgment that government by the masses leads to anarchy and so to tyranny and dictatorship. There might be a Liberal dictator, but there will be no government by a democratically elected Liberal Party without a resurgence of the national spirit. The issue is spiritual or moral more than political.

I turn to immediate Liberal policy. It is often said that Liberals believe first and last in liberty. This is true but may easily be misunderstood. *Pace* the sometimes egregious Lord Hailsham, Liberals have a clear idea of the kind of society they desire. It rests upon their understanding of human nature itself. Man is potentially and by the intention of his nature a moral and rational being, though morality and rationality are attainments rather than endowments. The liberty to which every man has a right is the liberty to realize his manhood and to exercise all his faculties as a rational and moral being. The task of the State is to provide the framework of society in which all the citizens shall be enabled and encouraged to fulfil the capacities of their rational and moral nature.

This sounds very abstract and philosophical, but it is the foundation of

immediate Liberal policies. It underlies the Civil Liberties Bill which Lord Rea is now presenting to the House of Lords, and which is the last of a series of attempts by Liberals, thwarted first by a Labour Government and then by Conservative Governments, to restore to the citizen some of those rights which have been gradually and surreptitiously filched from him by a swollen bureaucracy insufficiently controlled by the Common Law.

Second, the Welfare Society is a Liberal ideal; its foundations were laid by Liberals early in the century; its mature formulation was the work of an outstanding Liberal. "Sweated industries" involve despite done to human nature; the principle of the minimum wage must be accepted; even so, the very poor who live under the dark shadow of possible sickness, unemployment and old age must be given reasonable security that they may realize some fullness of life; the weak, the crippled, the unfortunate must as of right be helped by the community. All these provisions spring from a proper respect or reverence for human nature. But the purpose of the Welfare Society is to set men upon their feet, giving them, where they need it, such help and security that they may take their full place in society. But the Welfare Society has been developing ominously into the Socialist conception of the Welfare State which, so far from setting men upon their feet, tends to make all the pensioners of the public purse. The State's task is, or should be, residual; it should never do for individuals, groups, localities that which these could well and better do for themselves. It is not well for the country that working men should be assured that, however improvident they be, the State will always look after them; it is not well that manufacturers should be confident that, however ill managed or unnecessary their work be, they will always be "protected" from competition.

This leads me to the two closely connected Liberal principles, of free trade and honest money. Honest money means first of all that which keeps its value. The catastrophic drop in the value of the pound is a public scandal. To make the pound stable two things are necessary; first, the Government must cease to flood the market with money which is worth less and less; some 700 million notes have been issued in the last six years. Second, Government expenditure must be drastically reduced. The Government is now spending some 33 per cent of the national income; we shall not see safety till such expenditure is reduced to 25 per cent at most. It would be the unpopular but not impossible task of a Liberal Chancellor to reduce expenditure by 1½ per cent a year over five years. Honest money, further, means that currency issued passes wholly out of the issuer's control. This means that its possessor can spend it where and how he pleases. In other words, the pound once stable must be made convertible, and the miserable mechanism of Exchange Control, quotas, bulk buying, Investment Control and the Marketing Boards must come to a speedy and dishonoured end.

The possessor of money must likewise be permitted to buy in the cheapest market. This means free trade. Not only is free trade the most effective means to break up price rings which permeate industry and to stimulate our enterprise and opportunities, but it is the most important contribution to international good will and world peace that we can make.

It is significant that the Imports Duties Act of 1958 exempts from import

duties goods designed for the making, repairing and refitting of ships. The reason is that tariffs would, of course, increase the costs of those who urgently need ships. If the Government were considering the good of the country as the whole and not the special interests of private firms, they would have abolished import duties on all those goods required for the making, repairing and refitting of the houses we need so urgently. The cost of living for the public is artificially and deliberately raised in the interest of manufacturers who construct their price-rings behind the protecting wall of tariffs. The whole mechanism of Protection must be dismantled. This is not merely a question of economics; it is closely connected with world-peace, and it is contrary to natural justice that a citizen should be prevented from buying what he will where he will at the proper market price.

The country is divided and distracted by "unrest" in the industrial field. For a malaise that springs from the wrong attitude of sections of society to each other there can be no political panacea. It is to Liberals that the Trade Unions owe their legal status, and Liberals hope that the Trade Union leaders will set their own house in order in view of the abuses of power which are manifest today. If they cannot, a Royal Commission must investigate their position in the nation and report. But the root of the trouble is to be found not in Trade Unionism but in an industrial order that needs radical reform. Liberals take seriously their ideal of the ownership of property by all. They believe that the payment of high wages is "good for business"; they would give to wage-earners fiscal encouragement in the acquisition of houses through Building Societies, of insurance policies, of deposits in Savings Banks or Unit Investment Trusts; they would alter taxation so as to encourage rather than to penalize, as now, the promotion of such co-ownership schemes as may be appropriate in different industries; they would substitute steeply rising taxes on legacies for the present death-duties; they would revise Company Law to improve the status of the wage-earner especially in regard to his knowledge of the business in which he is engaged and his opportunities of rising in its service, and in regard to mutual consultation between all branches of a business. By such means Liberals would hope to give form and expression to a new relationship in industry and to unify the nation in a common service.

NATHANIEL MICKLEM  
*President of the Liberal Party Organization.*

### PROBLEMS OF FRANCE

WHATEVER military advantage it had been hoped to gain by the bombing of the Tunisian village of Sakhet the political consequences were disastrous. World opinion was shocked. The Atlantic Powers were greatly perturbed. The first report of the Tunisian Government threatened a deepening of the dispute with France. The circulation of the 15,000 French troops stationed in Tunisia was forbidden. The Tunisian

Ambassador in Paris was recalled. It was decided to demand the withdrawal of all French troops from the whole territory, including Bizerta. In the following days other measures were taken, including the closing of several French Consulates and the expulsion of certain French residents. An appeal was made to the Security Council of the United Nations. A serious debate on this appeal was avoided when the American and British Governments offered their "good offices," and was accepted by the two parties.

M. Bourguiba, playing his boldest hand and perhaps over-playing it, announced that he expected the "good offices" to settle the Algerian problem, having no longer confidence, he said, in a *tête-à-tête* with France. The French, on the other hand, excluded discussion of the Algerian problem from the debate, and insisted that the main object of the diplomatic operation should be to facilitate the reopening of direct negotiations between Paris and Tunis. As a preliminary the French were most immediately concerned with the removal of restrictions on the movement of French troops and a settlement of the affair of the Consulates. The Tunisian population had remained reasonably calm, but the confinement to barracks of 15,000 troops obviously could not continue without danger. The early visits of Mr. Robert Murphy, the American delegate, to Paris, London and Tunis were surrounded with a discretion which was an agreeable novelty in American diplomacy; but it is hardly likely that without preliminaries the Atlantic Powers would plunge at once into serious negotiation about the sweeping demands of M. Bourguiba for the settlement of Algeria and the "otanization" (the word is coined from OTAN, which is the French form of NATO) of the important naval base of Bizerta. Meanwhile, M. Bourguiba has proclaimed his sympathy with the Algerian rebels, and will have nothing to do with the Franco-Tunisian joint control of traffic across the Algerian frontier. *Action*, the weekly of Tunis, promises all the help to the rebels that Tunisians can give.

French opinion was taken aback by the Sakhiet bombing, and not less by M. Pineau's statement that the Government had not authorized it or been informed that it was projected. The fact that an act of such importance could be executed without specific permission of Ministers provoked the question whether in North African affairs the effective centre of government was Paris or Algiers. The same question had arisen after the seizure of the aeroplane of Ben Bella, which the Government had to accept and cover as a *fait accompli*. The fragile hold of the Gaillard Administration on public confidence was further damaged. But confidence had latterly been injured by another surprise: the revelation that during February the military activity of the Algerian rebels had flared up on a quite unexpected scale. Optimistic official declarations in December had spread the impression that as a military effort the rebellion had died down; but in February fighting was more intense and losses on both sides heavier than in February last year. As a consequence of operation of the national service law, the numbers of the expeditionary force had been reduced, by the return to France of conscript troops after their two years' service. Now the military command asked for reinforcements. The Independents (Conservatives) of the National Assembly urged the despatch of 80,000 men. The military chiefs did not

ask for so many, and the Government finally decided to send 28,000 to bring up the expeditionary force to its old total of 370,000. The military explanation of the requirements was that troops had had to be taken from the regular task of pacification of sections in the interior to strengthen the control of the Tunisian frontier.

To pay the cost of this measure it was necessary to increase the Budget vote for military expenditure. But that vote had already to be increased for other reasons, some of them, such as the increased prices of military materials, unconnected with the war. Altogether the sum to be found was about 84 milliards of francs. The choice of means to raise the money was limited. The large credits advanced to France from American and European sources in aid of French finances were granted on the assumption that she would keep her 1958 budget to the total expenditure and the limited deficit determined when the loans were asked for, and the French Government is morally bound to justify that assumption. In the end the Government proposed to find about 76 milliards of francs by economies on other items of the military vote, and to get the remaining 18 milliards by certain measures which depend on negotiation with Bonn and with the States maintaining military forces in Germany under the NATO. The Budgetary modifications involved in these measures were approved by the National Assembly.

Owing to these events what may be called the permanent political crisis has reached a *point névralgique*. The critical problem remains that of Algeria, whose "final quarter of an hour" seems to be extensible. The Resident Minister, M. Lacoste, continues to be hopeful. Thirteen decrees setting up the five autonomous territories and other institutions provided for in the *loi-cadre*, which is the provisional statute for the future Algeria, have been approved by the Government. M. Lacoste said that before long the special delegations which are to replace the existing municipalities will be formed. He told the Socialist group of the Assembly, however, that the "good offices" had had serious psychological effects on the Mussulmans. Such repercussions of the Tunisian affair and the "good offices" are not confined to the Algerian Mussulmans. The attitude of Morocco, which immediately after Sakhiet remained undemonstrative, seems to have evolved. Receiving a delegation of the syndicate of French provincial newspapers which called at Rabat on its way to Dakar, the King of Morocco, while reaffirming his friendship for France, referred to the French forces in Morocco and remarked that the presence of foreign troops was "in contradiction with our independence," and alluded to the territorial claims of Morocco on the Saharan frontier. He also expressed a desire for a "rapid pacific and political solution" of the Algerian problem, and finally spoke of his hope of seeing "the three North African countries" unified by the institution of a federation. M. Jacques Fauvet, writing recently in the *Monde*, said that "it is a fact that in spite of the official theses the Algerian problem is less and less a purely French affair"; and this evolution of Morocco goes to illustrate this view.

It is not surprising that the recent unfortunate turn of events should be attributed to the weakness and lack of initiative of the Government, both in the conduct of war and pacification in Algeria and in face of the Tunisian

incidents. The Government seems to be determined to carry out its project for a "no man's land" running along the Algerian side of the Tunisian frontier, intended to check the traffic in arms across the border. But the more aggressive of M. Gaillard's critics are not satisfied that a Government whose mishandling of affairs culminated in the unpleasant necessity of "good offices" is competent to pursue the Algerian policy to a decisive conclusion. A small chorus including M. Duchet, a leader of the Independents, M. Bidault, and others called for a Government with extended powers. M. Morice said that France was at the 1917 stage (the year of Clemenceau's entry into action). M. Soustelle declared that a government of public safety was needed, and that among the statesmen available there was only one man capable of enjoying abroad the authority necessary to ensure respect for the vital interests of France both in North Africa and the other African territories: General de Gaulle.

At last, after much coquetting with the name of General de Gaulle during successive Ministerial crises, the suggestion of recourse to him was thus put forward by a prominent politician who was one of the General's lieutenants in the early days of the R.P.F. Other politicians have made the same proposal. The idea of a "temporary magistracy" of General de Gaulle seems to have made its way into some section of opinion. There is a good deal of support for the suggestion among the professional political observers—probably more than in the precincts of the Palais Bourbon—who think that in face of the prolonged incapacity of the National Assembly to produce an effective Government the only remedy remaining is a delegation of the Government's powers. In the sketchy conception of the "temporary magistracy" there would doubtless be some modification, provisional or otherwise, of the Constitution, and a long recess of Parliament. This vague design owed its inception to anti-Parliamentary feeling aroused by recent events. But if extended powers were to be obtained they would have to be voted by Parliament. At present no single group as a whole would vote thus, though they might find support among the rank and file of various groups, as the R.P.F. had done 10 years ago.

Proposals for some limited amendments of the Constitution were debated slowly and with great difficulty. There is a fundamental difficulty in designing arrangements for a dissolution of the National Assembly on the defeat of a Government, or on a succession of defeats occurring within a limited period. The trouble arises from the fact that at the election succeeding a dissolution the parties, whether belonging to the Government coalition or not, would each go to the polls on its own account. Many of those who advocate provisions for dissolution do so in the hope that the fear of such an event will of itself discourage parties from precipitating the fall of Ministries.

An official account of the French proposals for the regulation of the relation between the Common Market and the 11 European countries remaining outside it shows them to be so complex as to discourage the most well-meaning attempt to apply them in practice. So far as the general summary permits an understanding of it, the comparatively simple idea of a Free Trade Area is split up into a plan of defined trade sectors, with

regard to each of which the relation of each of the 17 countries concerned with the others comes leave to be negotiated in detail.

M. Gaillard's concluding speech in the debate on the vote of military credits went much beyond that immediate purpose. It was obviously designed to restate the French position in the Franco-Tunisian dispute, but also to extend the area of discussion by new and wide proposals. Specific points concern the surveillance of the Algero-Tunisian frontier, the regrouping of French forces stationed in Algeria, the establishment of measures to prevent any use of Tunisian aerodromes for the advantage of the Algerian rebels, the maintenance of the French occupation of Bizerta, and the withdrawal of the measures taken by the Tunisian Government in closing several French consulates. These stipulations mark no positive advance towards the Tunisian case, though the regrouping of troops and the position at Bizerta may presumably give occasion for bargaining. On the other hand M. Gaillard renews the assurance that the independence of Tunisia is respected. But the French Prime Minister made a much wider proposal by inviting Tunisia and Morocco to join with France and with "French Algeria" in the economic exploitation of the Sahara. In all this there is to be no internationalization of the problem of Algeria, which, he said, with wide administrative liberty under the statute provisionally outlined in the *loi-Cadre*, would fit naturally into its place in this France-North Africa combination. Further, M. Gaillard proposed to associate not only North Africa but the European powers on the borders of the western Mediterranean in a combination forming a north-south axis of defence. This project requires elucidation, which M. Gaillard promised. British interests in the Mediterranean will have to be taken into account, among other things. The speech was not acclaimed by all the groups supporting the Government with unanimous enthusiasm. But in some degree it lightened the atmosphere created by the Sakhiet incident and the "good offices." In producing a large scheme interesting the western Mediterranean countries as a whole M. Gaillard has also diverted attention from the too feverish subject of Tunisia, and has given time for a calm discussion. Part of the agitation calling for a return of General de Gaulle to power has arisen from the feeling that the Gaillard Government, like so many of its predecessors, has submitted to events rather than acted with initiative.

The Republican Socialists (ex-Gaullists) have expressed the fear that the western Mediterranean community proposed by M. Gaillard may be a step towards internationalisation of the Algerian problem. They have not, however, asked M. Chaban-Delmas, the Minister of National Defence, the one member of their party who is in the Government, to resign. The Republican Socialist group is not very large, but the suspicion that the Mediterranean project is the thin end of the wedge of internationalisation and would involve the lowering of the French position in North Africa is shared by a good many people.

Speculative discussion about the possibility of General de Gaulle's return to politics continues rather intermittently. M. Duclos in *L'Humanité* declares against another "dictatorial experiment." The chief importance of this position lies in the fact that on any proposal to grant extended powers

to the head of a government the 140 votes of the Communists in the National Assembly would count heavily. As there is a good deal of conflict of opinion on the subject in the Assembly these arithmetical considerations may actually favour the continuance in office of the Gaillard Government for the present. Among all the controversies dividing France perhaps the most acute at the moment is that between those who wish to intensify the warfare in Algeria and those who wish for prompt peace by negotiation.

On March 13 a demonstration of discontented policemen in front of the Palais Bourbon, where the National Assembly was in session, furnished an unexpected example of disrespect for Parliament. It was carried out by policemen off duty and was not intended to be violent, but to advertise publicly grievances of the profession. One of the claims advanced by the police related to a bonus for dangerous service, the service in question probably including the pursuit of North African disturbers of the peace in Paris. The demonstration continued before the doors of the National Assembly for about three hours. Deputies protested both against the policemen's breach of rules and against the neglect of ministers to prepare measures against a possible demonstration. The first result of this grave affair was the resignation of the Prefect of Police.

*Vernon, Eure.*

W. L. MIDDLETON

## THE IRISH TREATY PORTS IN 1938. PART II

DURING the years between the signing of the Treaty in 1921 and the Agreement in 1938 many important events had taken place. While the Treaty, according to Mr. Churchill had been kept in the letter and the spirit by Great Britain, it had been violated and repudiated in every detail by Mr. De Valera. He had repudiated practically for all purposes the Crown. He had repudiated the appeal to the Privy Council as well as the financial arrangements made at the time of the Treaty. We had given away our whole position on Land Annuities, without arbitration of any kind, on account of a payment of £10,000,000 which was, according to Mr. Churchill, a derisory payment if it was to be regarded as a settlement of the sum in question, because practically we had given away £100,000,000 to which we had a valid claim.

The British public followed the negotiations with great interest and they learnt from the Press on March 12, 1938, that there had been a long interview between Mr. De Valera and Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Dominions. On that day Mr. De Valera had gone to 10 Downing Street at 11 a.m. and had remained in conversation with the Prime Minister for an hour and a half, and afterwards Mr. MacDonald had had an interview with the Prime Minister. It was not, however, till April 26, 1938, that it was learnt that three Agreements had been come to with the Free State. The Dominions Office then issued the following announcement:—

"The discussions between representatives of the United Kingdom Government and the Government of Eire have now been concluded. An agreement has been reached. Mr. De Valera and his colleagues will come

to London to meet the Prime Minister and his colleagues for the purpose of signature next Monday afternoon, the 25th April."

The first Agreement referred to Articles 6 and 7 of the Treaty of December 6, 1921, and it was stated that the

"1. Provisions of Articles 6 and 7 of the Treaty signed on the 6th day of December, 1921, and of the Annex thereto shall cease to have effect.

"2. Thereafter the Government of the United Kingdom will transfer to the Government of Eire the Admiralty property and rights at Berehaven, Cobh (Queenstown) and Lough Swilly now occupied by care and maintenance parties furnished by the United Kingdom, together with buildings, magazines, implantations, instruments and fixed armaments with ammunition therefor, at present at the said ports.

"3. The transfer will take place not later than 31st December, 1938."

This Agreement was signed on April 25, 1938, on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom by Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Simon, Sir Samuel Hoare, Malcolm MacDonald and T. W. H. Inskip, Minister for the Co-ordination of Defence and afterwards Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice of England with the title of Viscount Caldecote. It was signed on behalf of the Government of Eire by Mr. De Valera, Mr. Lemass, Mr. MacEntee and Mr. Ryan.

Speaking in the Dail in Dublin on April 28 Mr. De Valera prophesied that "in a short time Ireland would be a completely independent sovereign state." The ports (he said) are handed over unconditionally. The signing of the Agreement was followed by an election campaign in Southern Ireland. Mr. De Valera's son, Vivion, in a speech at Buncrana on June 5, 1938, referring to the handing over of the forts at Lough Swilly said:—

"The enemy is going out and that territory is now ours. We have got the Swilly, Derry is the next objective."

Mr. T. J. O'Kelly, Minister for Local Government (now President of the Irish Republic), speaking at an election meeting in Dublin said:—

"Remember what a tremendous advance we have made. Powerful influences opposed us politically, financially, economically and in every other way. I do think that no one will doubt that England and the British Empire are a political force in the world today and in the last six years look how we have whipped John Bull every time. Look at the last Agreement we have made with her. We won all round us. We wiped her left, right and centre and with God's help we shall do the same again."

On May 5, 1938, Mr. Chamberlain, the Prime Minister, moved in the House of Commons a resolution approving the Agreement. He said:—

"There was no part of our discussions with the Ministers from Eire which gave us more prolonged and more anxious thought than the subject of defence. A request was made to us that we should hand back to the Government of Eire the full and unrestricted possession of certain ports. After consideration of all the circumstances and after due consultation with the Chiefs of Staff we came to the conclusion that a friendly Ireland was worth far more to us both in peace and in war than these paper rights which could only be exercised at the risk of maintaining, and perhaps increasing, their sense of grievance, and so we have agreed that, subject

to Parliamentary confirmation, the ports shall be handed over unconditionally to the Government of Eire."

Speaking in the same debate Mr. Churchill subjected the new Agreement to searching analysis. He mentioned that when the Irish Treaty was being shaped he had been instructed by the Cabinet to prepare that part of the Agreement which dealt with strategic reservations.

"The Admiralty of those days," he said, "assured me that without the use of these ports it would be very difficult—perhaps almost impossible—to feed these islands in time of war. Queenstown and Berehaven shelter the flotillas which keep clear the approaches to the Bristol and English channels, and Lough Swilly is the base from which the access to the Mersey and the Clyde is covered."

In sentences which now seem to have been prophetic Mr. Churchill said:—

"What guarantee have you that Southern Ireland—the Irish Republic as they claim to be—will not declare neutrality if we are engaged in war with some powerful nation? The first step certainly which such an enemy might take would be to offer complete immunity of every kind to Southern Ireland if she remained neutral."

We now learn from Volume VII of the Documents on German Foreign Policy, which were seized in Germany after the Allies invaded the country, that on August 29, 1939, a despatch was sent by Herr von Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Secretary, to the German Minister in Dublin in which he said:—

"In accordance with the friendly relations between ourselves and Ireland we are determined to refrain from any hostile action against Irish territory and to respect her integrity, provided that Ireland for her part maintains unimpeachable neutrality towards us in any conflict."

The German Minister in Eire telegraphed to the Foreign Minister in Berlin on August 31:—

"I carried out my instructions today in the presence of Walshe (Joseph P. Walshe, Secretary to the Department of External Affairs). De Valera repeated the statement previously mentioned in my report of February 23rd, 1939 that the Government's aim was to remain neutral. It was agreed that a public announcement should appear in the Press on the morning of September 3rd confirming the Agreement with regard to the neutrality of Eire."

This was the very day on which war was declared by Great Britain against Germany. It was thus that the prophecy made by Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons on May 5, 1938, was fulfilled to the letter, when he had insisted that the danger which had to be considered was that Ireland might be neutral if we were engaged in war with some powerful nation. This speech was made while he was still in opposition. After he had become the head of the Government in 1940 the first speech which I heard him make in the House of Commons on the very day that I took my seat on November 5, 1940, showed that he had been right in the warning which he had given. He said:—

"More serious than the air-raids has been the recent recrudescence of

U-boat sinkings in the Atlantic approaches to our islands. The fact that we cannot use the South and West coasts of Ireland to refuel our flotillas and aircraft and thus protect the trade by which Ireland as well as Great Britain lives, is a most heavy and grievous burden, and one which should never have been placed on our shoulders, broad though they be."

Mr. De Valera replied to this speech in the Eire Chamber of Deputies on November 7, 1940, when he said:—

"There can be no question of the handing over of these ports as long as this State remains neutral. There can be no question of leasing these ports. They are ours. They are within our sovereignty and there can be no question as long as we remain neutral of handing them over on any condition whatsoever. Any attempt to bring pressure to bear upon us by any side—by any of the belligerents—by Britain—could only lead to bloodshed."

In answer to a question which I put in the House of Commons on February 18, 1942, Mr. Shakespeare, Under-Secretary for the Dominions, replied that:—

"The Government of Northern Ireland was not consulted with regard to the abrogation in the Agreement of 1938 of the clause in the Agreement of 1921 reserving to the Imperial Forces the use of Lough Swilly. As has been made clear in a public statement by the present Prime Minister of Northern Ireland and his predecessor, the Northern Ireland Government is not a party to the Agreement of 1938 relating to the transfer of the port."

The Speaker allowed me to put the following supplementary question. "Does the Minister realize how very seriously Northern Ireland is concerned and that Lough Swilly is within seven miles of the City of Londonderry?" Mr. Shakespeare replied: "I realize that."

At the time of the negotiations Mr. Andrews, Minister of Labour and subsequently Prime Minister, journeyed to and from London many times to plead with the British Government to stay their hand. "I saw Mr. MacDonald myself," said Mr. Andrews, "and told him it was an act of folly." He answered, "No, it is an act of faith."

Lord Chatfield, Admiral of the Fleet and First Sea Lord and Chief of Naval Staff from 1933 to 1938, says in his book "It Might Happen Again":—

"that a new and safer Agreement with Ireland (than that of 1921) was very necessary and the political wheels were beginning to turn slowly in that direction. If a friendly Agreement would increase the assurance that we could rely on the use of the Irish ports, should we become involved in war, and, by the creation of a better feeling, make it safe to base our defensive and offensive strategy on such an assurance, the Admiralty anxiety would be greatly reduced. The political aim as expressed by the Dominions Secretary, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, was the creation of the prospect of a more abundant friendship with the Irish people."

In a letter to *The Times* Lord Chatfield wrote on February 4, 1942:—

"There were two considerations. First, the political opinion that if we handed back the ports there would be a hope that an improved

atmosphere would be created that might enable the Navy under the circumstances of war to use the ports by consent; secondly, a greater chance that Eire ports would be denied to the enemy for hostile action against us."

I wrote to *The Times* four letters on this subject dated February 4, February 7, February 11 and February 13. Lord Stanhope, First Lord of the Admiralty 1938-1939, took up the cudgels on behalf of Lord Chatfield and wrote to *The Times* on February 11 to say that the "hinterlands of these ports retained under the Treaty of 1921 were so exiguous that the ports were commanded at close range from outside the areas held by the forces of Great Britain." In reply I wrote to *The Times* to say that Clause 7a of the Agreement of 1921 must always be taken in conjunction with Clause b under which the Government of the Irish Free State undertook to afford "to His Majesty's Imperial Forces in time of war such harbour and other facilities as the British Government may require." I added: "It is evident from this clause that the approaches and environs of the ports could have been legitimately demanded, but even without these my military friends in all three ports had assured me that they were prepared to hold them successfully against all-comers."

Mr. MacDonald, subsequently appointed United Kingdom High Commissioner in Canada, told the Women's Canadian Club that "Eire's neutrality has exposed Britain to great dangers. It has increased the possibilities of enemy espionage on our shores, aggravated the danger of U-boat attacks against Atlantic convoys, and left open a flank in our defences against invasion." Lord Maugham had succeeded Lord Hailsham as Lord Chancellor on March 9, 1938, but he tells us that this matter of the Anglo-Irish Agreement had been settled in the Cabinet before he came on the scene. He says, however, that his predecessor "told me that he had strongly protested against these provisions of the Anglo-Irish Agreement but had been over-ruled." Lord Maugham says he felt the same consternation as Mr. Churchill, and that the debate of May 5, 1938, was painful reading in the light of subsequent events. The last word on these agreements signed on April 25, 1938—less than 18 months before the outbreak of the Second World War—was made by Sir Winston Churchill, when he said: "A more feckless act can hardly be imagined."

DOUGLAS L. SAVORY

## ALEXANDER THE GREAT

WHAT does the so-called educated average man know about the heroes of antiquity and especially about Alexander the Great? The much used and abused words epoch-making, fascinating, unique, fit him not as clichés but as absolute realities. That he was epoch-making his admirers and his critics agree. Nothing after his death was as before. Alexander's (or Iskander's) sagas were spread in 90 versions in 28 languages from Malaya to Britain. Even the Middle Ages had its

*Roman d'Alexandre.* This is the more remarkable because seldom were a hero's doings so adequately and thoroughly described by eyewitnesses. For example, the battle of Issos is shown by the grandiose Pompeii mosaic—the flight of the Persian King Darius the coward before the irresistible cavalry charge of the Macedonians led as always by Alexander. We know that his complexion was fair, that he had radiant blue eyes, and that he held his head a little sideways. But all these in many respects trustworthy accounts were only apt to inflame the fantasy of people who seek the fairy tale in reality, the halo of the world conqueror, of his beauty and valour, with the tragic background of early death.

Philip of Macedonia, his father, cynic and intriguer, was unsurpassed as an organiser. He imposed unity, created the army—not as an armed crowd of amateurs like the troops of the Greek polis, but as a trained and hardened body. He added the Thessalian cavalry and improved the phalanx which the military genius of Epaminondas used as a deadly weapon of Thebes against the military supremacy of Sparta. He employed the most powerful engines to destroy fortresses which his son could use in the terrible sieges of Tyre and Gaza. More important still than the debt to his father was the heritage from his mother Olympias, a princess of Epirot extraction who claimed descent from Achilles. Devoted to the cult of Dionysos she danced as a bacchante thrysos in hand and serpents crawling about at the festivals near Olympia, which Euripides (as a refugee in Macedonia) depicts in one of his most impressive tragedies. She could never get on with the prosaic Philip who took women and wine for his pleasure. She dreamed before marriage that with thunder and lightning the God Dionysos had taken possession of her body in the shape of a snake. She was certainly privy to the plan to murder Philip when he married another princess free from all demonic influences. She did more. After Philip's death she murdered the infant child of this wife, graciously allowing her to choose the manner of her suicide. Olympias knew that her son was something above the average. Aristotle, whom the parents selected as instructor, also knew it. To him Alexander owes his multifarious knowledge, and the indomitable intellectual curiosity animated him till the last day of his life. Even the unpoetical Stagirite declared that a man who in every respect was prominent and successful above all others could be called a god.

Mysticism and ruthlessness, military talents and cunning combined to form Alexander's complex character. He begins with liquidating all possible competitors for the throne. He commits an act of wilful terrorism by the destruction of recalcitrant Thebes where Dionysos was reputed to have lived, the town of Oedipus and Antigone, but after this thunderbolt he generously accepts the surrender of Athens. He adopts Philip's *maîtresse* to unite Greece and Macedonia in a national and religious campaign against Persia, a war of revenge for the devastation of temples and towns in the days of Marathon and Salamis. The Persians were defeated, but they acquired a much more effective ascendancy over the corrupt Grecian statesmen through lavish bribery. This ascendancy and the servitude of the Greek towns on the coast of Asia Minor were immedi-

ately abolished by the first two glorious victories of Alexander at the Granikos and Issos.

The swiftness of his marches, totalling 18,000 kilometres, day and night in summer or winter was Napoleonic, and the oblique front of his troops was imitated by Marlborough and Frederick the Great. He suddenly changed his tactics against elements and chariots. He changed it again in the mountains against the Bactrians, and again in guerilla warfare. Perhaps the greatest military genius of all times, he never lost a battle and always inspired the troops with his own fury. He was equally successful in making friends with the vanquished, as with the kings Taxiles and Poros in India, and he prepared a complete reconciliation with the Iranians despite the fierce opposition of his generals. Conspiracies had to be quelled. Philotas, a prominent chief of the "companions," Callisthenes the brilliant historian, and several pages were cruelly executed. Kleitos, who saved his life at the Granikos, was killed by Alexander himself in a drunken orgy. Old Parmenio, the chief of staff and a most trustworthy servant, was murdered without trial by the king's order only because he was the father of Philotas. He then remained for three days of shame and repentance in his tent and had to be saved by friends from committing suicide.

Achilles, Hercules and Dionysos are the three "superegos," as the Freudians call it, of his existence—very naturally Alexander being the son of his mother. On arriving in Asia Minor he views the ruins of Troy and sacrifices to the memory of the son of Thetis. He imitates Achilles' cruelty against the corpse of Hector. He adores Hephaistion, his most able general, as Achilles adored Patroklos. After Hephaistion's death he falls into deep depression, as gigantic as all he did and planned—equally gigantic should also have been the monument in honour of the deceased. But it was the dionysic idea which made the victor seek for the end of the earth, surrounded by Okeanos. Dionysos presided at the sport and theatrical festivals which Alexander showed to all the conquered. It may also have been Dionysos whose madness was responsible for the terrible crime of burning Persepolis, the cultural, artistic and religious capital of Persia. Or was it the vision of the burning Ilion which he wanted to stage? Perhaps if he had lived he would have gone west to oust Carthago from its prominent position in the Mediterranean. He would have greeted the memory of Hercules with mystical joy at the Column of Hercules at the gate of the Atlantic. His adventurous expedition from Egypt to the oasis of Siva and its celebrated oracle was a preparation for these plans. There, the oracle testified that the son of Philip was in fact the son of the Solar God Ammon. After Issos and still more after the battle of Gaugamela, where he had most heavy odds against him, he assumed more and more a hieratic attitude at least officially. Assuming the insignia of a despot, he demanded as a greeting the prostrate attitude even from the free Hellenes. He married a beautiful Bactrian princess Rukanash, called Roxana, the daughter of a Satrap. He really loved her, and at one of those exuberant feasts which he found relaxing 10,000 Greeks were ready to imitate him and marry Iranian women. It was the army which put a sudden end to his dionysiac and Heraklean march to the Infinite. It was the tremendous waste of energy

which made him die at 33 years of age of the same malaria which, with forces unhampered, he had overcome at Tarsus.

If we ask what we can learn from his life, triumph and tragedy, tired as we are of all ideas of conquest and world domination, the answer is tolerance. He never interfered with the creed, race, or the national customs of a people. If he had lived he might have solved the main political problem of our "free world," the unity between West and East in the inspiring atmosphere of Greek culture. Even after his untimely death the Diadochs, his successors, though fighting each other, took the same line. Under the Ptolemies Egypt and especially Alexandria became immense centres of learning according to his wishes. The same can be said about the Seleucids in Central Asia and the Antigonites in Syria. Thus Alexander opened the way, not only by his victories, but also by free trade and a common gold standard for the Roman Empire and through this for Christianity. Arrian says that many sovereigns have committed crimes, but none of them had repented them like Alexander. His comet-like career gives us also a solemn warning against unbounded ambition. If he, the god-like, broke down under his exertions, who would dare to follow his path without his genius? Even so as a comet he remains an object of constant study, of praise and censure. It is to be regretted that the idea of a Greek sculptor could not be realized. A giant monument of the conqueror as big as that which commemorates Washington with his features and his figure, hewn out of the cliffs of Mount Athos, two thousand metres high. His majestic head is in the clouds and at his feet the rolling ocean which he loved.

ERNST BENEDEKT.

### REVOLT IN ALGERIA

THE year 1958 sees the beginning of the fourth year of insurrection in Algeria. This serious situation has affected not only France's commitments with NATO in Europe by obliging her to withdraw troops for Algeria, but has also kept North Africa in a state of unrest. Morocco and Tunisia, ex-French Protectorates, are linked with Algeria and her people by ties of religion, culture and blood. Naturally, despite treaties with France negotiated at the time of their own independence, they sympathize with Algerian nationalism. The rebels take advantage of this both in demanding material and financial help and by seeking sanctuary over the borders.

France has tried to keep the revolt localized. This dangerous situation has been watched with anxiety by the Western powers and with hope by Russia and Egypt. Negotiations between the nationalist FLN (Front de Libération Nationale) and the French Government have been rendered impossible because of the determination of both sides to keep to their demands. France, since the 1947 Statute, considers Algeria part of the metropolis, while the nationalists refuse to negotiate until they are promised ultimate independence. French troops, of which there are some 500,000, suffer

casualties from continual attack by guerillas, while inflicting serious losses on the rebels. During February alone 1,500 nationalists were killed. French casualties were less than half. But as long as the FLN continues to receive help from sympathizing Arab states it will be difficult for France to defeat them finally. The French have fortified Algeria's frontiers with Morocco and Tunisia, but the rebels continue to cross them and even to fire on French troops and aeroplanes from their shelter. For the past three years there have been continual incidents of this nature which have led to notes and recriminations between Algeria and her two neighbours. It was a foregone conclusion that this would lead to a serious incident like the bombardment of Sakhiet, which has brought the whole Algerian question once more to world attention and UN notice.

Algeria was the first of France's annexations in North Africa. French troops were landed on June 14, 1830, after shelling Algiers. They gradually conquered the whole country from the fertile Tell bordering the Mediterranean to the more arid mountains and the vast *Territoires du Sud* comprising much of the Sahara desert. After the troops came the settlers, and large companies indulged in land speculation. Modern methods of agriculture vastly improved the land, new areas were irrigated, extensive vineyards planted, towns sprang up. Although the Crémieux decree of 1871 gave all Jews in Algeria French nationality, French citizens were considerably outnumbered by the Moslem inhabitants. According to the 1954 census there are some 850,000 Europeans (French, Jews and a minority of Spanish and Italians) and some 10 million Algerians. All, of course, are technically French citizens since the 1947 Statute. They are all supposed to share the same benefits of schooling, jobs, pay and opportunities of advancement. In fact they do not. It is difficult to amalgamate and treat as one people two such completely different races. On one hand the European Christians with a much higher level of civilization, on the other the Moslem Arabs, many illiterate and all with a different culture, traditions and customs.

The rise of nationalism throughout North Africa encouraged the aspirations of an Algerian minority. On October 31, 1954, widespread revolt broke out in different parts of Algeria. When France conceded independence to her two neighbouring protectorates, Algerian nationalist hopes rose. The Middle East Arab states fomented the unrest; it is still largely financed by them. Representatives of the FLN have recently been visiting Iraq and other Arab states to ask for more financial help. Iraq has already lent 325 million francs, and 175 million francs have been given by private donations. Recently the French intercepted a cargo of arms and munitions on a Yugoslav ship which was ostensibly taking them to Casablanca, and there have been other incidents of the same kind.

The Arab states have already brought the Algerian question before the United Nations. The FLN and the smaller MNA have both appealed to the West without result. Now they are turning to the ready help of Communism. It is said that the rebels are infiltrated by Communists. Egypt has offered help and sanctuary to many exiled leaders. As the rebels are led by a group, despite the French capture of five of their leaders in 1956 the revolt continues by others.

France's continual changes of government have not helped the situation. Each has a different solution. Mendès-France and his ministry lost power before they could carry out his plan. A French politician not only has to take into account his party's politics and do the best for France; he has to deal with powerful French interests and "colons" in Algeria who have no intention of losing their rich possessions nor their power. It is these men who have hindered the passing of the proposals for new reforms embodied in the "loi Cadre." Despite them, and after much discussion, this basic law, destined to give Algeria great autonomy along federal lines, was at last passed by the French Assembly and Conseil de la République. It will be some time before these measures can be put into effect. Meanwhile they neither meet with the approval of a certain section of French politics nor with that of the rebels.

Now comes the bombardment of the Tunisian town of Sakhet to estrange France still further from her former North African territories. It is not yet known who gave the order, but it would seem to have been done on the orders of General Salan, Commander-in-Chief in Algeria. Though obviously unprepared, M. Gaillard's government has backed the action. It is difficult to condone such open aggression against a free State, especially when there were civilian dead and wounded.

There have been more incidents along the 500 mile Tunisian frontier than along the Moroccan. The Tunisians claim there have been some 50 incidents which have continually got more serious. Recently the rebels have fired on French planes from inside Tunisia. According to the French, Sakhet was a rebel headquarters where they had fortified the school and other buildings. The French have repeatedly asked the Tunisian authorities to prevent the rebels from attacking French troops and planes from the shelter of their territory, but with little result. It looks as if the army, losing patience, had suddenly decided on drastic measures without thinking of the political consequences. They no doubt wiped out the rebels at Sakhet, but they also destroyed foreign property and killed civilians.

The attack by three waves of some 25 fighters and bombers lasted from 10.50 till 12.30 on Sunday, February 9. They left the town in ruins, among which was a wrecked Swiss Red Cross ambulance. There were some 75 dead, among them women and children, and over 100 wounded. President Bourguiba immediately demanded the withdrawal of all French troops as well as the naval base at Bizerta. To avoid further serious incidents the French ordered all their troops—some 15,000—confined to barracks. Tunisian troops, on the orders of their government, immediately barricaded all roads leading to French camps and barracks to prevent all movement. The Tunisian authorities appealed for calm and, although some crowds met and there were strikes, nothing worse happened. However, the situation for French troops with no possibility of getting provisions became serious as the days passed. In one place they killed a horse—in others helicopters and the local Tunisian merchants were able to relieve their position. President Bourguiba has used Sakhet as an excuse to get rid of French troops which he has long wanted. The Tunisian authorities have also expelled over 500 French families from their farms and businesses and are continuing to do

so. The French government declared itself willing to pay compensation to the victims. The United States has offered 80,000 dollars, and the other Moroccan states have also offered help.

For a long time France and Tunisia have been negotiating for the withdrawal of French troops, but the French refuse to withdraw without negotiation. As for their naval base at Bizerta, they refuse to leave it. President Bourguiba has suggested that NATO take it over, to which the French answer by threatening to demand the same for the British bases at Gibraltar and Malta. They also refuse to close five Consulates in Tunisia and insist on controlling Tunisian airfields to prevent their use by the rebels, armed and trained in Egypt. Faced by this serious situation, Great Britain and the United States have sent mediators. Tunisia has declared itself willing to come to an agreement with France, but each side insists on their own terms. If the mediation is not satisfactory, President Bourguiba declared he would bring the whole question before the United Nations. Many French diplomats openly declare that the bombardment was a great mistake. As M. Mendes-France declared recently, it will further estrange North Africa from France. Not only that but it will push them towards Communism and Russia. The Tunisians also blame the United States for helping France with arms and money, while France blames both Great Britain and the United States for sending arms to Tunisia, which, they say, only pass into rebel hands and prolong the struggle.

There is another obstacle to negotiation. While France will not hear of discussing the Algerian problem, maintaining it only concerns herself. Tunisia wants the whole discussed together. Recently the Tunisian President broadcast an appeal to the Western Nations to try and persuade France to give Algeria her independence. To prevent further incidents, France proposes creating a no man's land along the Tunisian border. This will mean evacuating several thousand Algerian natives, which has raised an outcry of cruelty from Tunisia and the other Arab states. Meanwhile, Algeria remains a danger spot.

*Tangier.*

MARY R. BULL

## THE SECOND EMPIRE XV. THE MEXICAN FIASCO

THE Empress took little interest in the Crimean War and detested her husband's Italian policy. Of the three major foreign enterprizes of the Second Empire the Mexican gamble alone commanded the enthusiasm of both. Had it prospered they would have shared the glory; since it failed they shared the disgrace of the greatest disaster before Sedan. Wishful thinking, inexcusable miscalculation, above all the flouting of the Monroe Doctrine, indicate that the spirit of the gaming-table remained at work in the Man of Destiny. The whole poignant story was told for the first time by Count Egon Corti in 1923 with the aid of the correspondence of the luckless Emperor Maximilian and the Empress Charlotte.

Mexico, like most other fragments of the Spanish Empire, had been a prey to revolutions and civil war ever since the expulsion of its Spanish rulers. The rise and fall of military dictatorships drove the losers in the latest round of the boxing match to seek refuge in Europe, where they built castles in the air, quarrelled with each other, and sought support for their competing schemes. Both Emperor and Empress had long been interested in Central America, the former advocating a Nicaragua Canal, the latter listening to the talk of Hidalgo, a young Mexican diplomatist in her mother's salon in Spain. Numerous investors in England, France and Spain had material reasons for concerning themselves with the fate of the country, and for desiring an end to the chronic anarchy which was ruinous to its inhabitants and its creditors alike. In this atmosphere of chronic frustration certain *émigrés* dreamed of importing a *deus ex machina* from the Old World; no European Prince, however, could be expected to undertake such a perilous task without the backing of one or more of the Great Powers.

In 1856 the Archduke Maximilian, younger brother of the Emperor Francis Joseph, arrived in Paris to report on the ruler and his entourage. It was the sunniest phase of the Second Empire, for French arms had restored their prestige in the Crimean War and an heir to the throne had been born. "The Emperor, who received me at St. Cloud, was ill at ease," reported the visitor. "His short, unimpressive stature, his exterior, which is utterly lacking in nobility, his shuffling gait, his ugly hands, the sly inquiring glance of his lustreless eyes: all this was not calculated to correct my first unfavourable impression." The Empress, still weak from her confinement, appeared no less embarrassed, though she took great pains to please. "Her undeniable beauty, aided considerably by art, shows no trace of the Spanish type. She is of good family, but lacks the august quality of an empress. The dinner was badly served, the Emperor unquiet, the conversation dull." A state banquet next day was equally unimpressive. "The Emperor's embarrassment was obvious. Probably he felt uncomfortable in the presence of a prince of older lineage. When he overcomes this restraint he displays great frankness. The more I know him, the greater seems his confidence in me. There is a laudable intention to create a suitable Court, but the whole machinery does not yet work smoothly. The stamp of the *parvenu* is on everything. He seems respected by many but beloved by none. I try to be very agreeable and to conceal my unpleasant impressions. His transformation of Paris is almost incredible—all very brilliant but evidently intended for the moment alone. The Emperor lives in great retirement. He and the Empress are hardly greeted in the street except by members of the Court. He does not accompany me when I move about; perhaps it would upset him to have me witness this universal indifference. I lunch daily with the Emperor and Empress. His personality is unattractive at first sight, but ultimately creates a favourable impression by his great calm and noble simplicity of character. The Empress's gaiety and naive vivacity do not always seem to please him. The whole impression is that of a make-believe Court, the posts filled by courtiers not very sure of their part. This Court is absolutely lacking in tone." As the days passed

the ruler overcame his embarrassment, talked freely about international problems, and displayed marked amiability towards his guest. "I was far better pleased with his manner during the closing days of my visit than at first I could have expected. Yet my regret at leaving Paris was small, indeed I blessed the day when I left the centre of civilization." His hosts, on the other hand, had been greatly attracted to their visitor.

A year later Hidalgo visited the Empress at Biarritz, described the misery of his country, and suggested the establishment of a Catholic Monarchy in Central America. Fascinated by the idea, she promised to speak to her husband. She knew nothing of the United States and liked republics as little as Queen Victoria. Sooner or later, she exclaimed in 1853, war must be declared against them, a frothy utterance gently rebuked by the Emperor. At her wish Hidalgo was invited to Compiègne in the autumn of 1858, and now for the first time the Emperor inquired about Mexico.

*Hidalgo* The news is very bad and the country faces ruin unless Your Majesty helps us.

*Emperor* Nothing can be done without England. We told Palmerston on a recent visit to Compiègne that an army and vast sums would be needed, as well as a prince.

*Hidalgo* Your Majesty knows that Don Juan has been mentioned.

*Emperor* We thought of the *Duc d'Aumale*, but he declines.

Delighted to learn that the Dictator had been thinking about his country, Hidalgo stressed the danger of Latin America falling under the influence of the United States if no action were taken. He continued to visit the Emperor and Empress, making little progress with the former who kept repeating that he would gladly act, but how could he without England? The impulsive Empress, on the other hand, never interested in the prosaic details which make or mar great enterprizes, became ever more obsessed by the project, and the repudiation in 1861 by Juarez of debts incurred by his predecessor brought intervention within the sphere of practical politics. Though the new radical and anticlerical Dictator Juarez had ousted his conservative rival Miramon, he failed to maintain order or to win popularity and the search for a ruler went on.

When England and Spain seemed inclined to champion the interests of their nationals the Emperor prepared to bestir himself. The French Minister in Mexico favoured action. Thouvenel, the Foreign Minister, approved, and Morny was in touch with Jecker, a Swiss financier who had lent large sums to Miramon. Various candidates were discussed by the émigrés and, with the approval of Napoleon III, Maximilian was approached in his fairy palace of Miramar. The Archduke and Charlotte, his ambitious Belgian wife, were longing for a crown, and Francis Joseph cautiously welcomed the opportunity of a dazzling career for his brother. Two conditions he required—the active support of England and France and a definite invitation from Mexico. Since the venerable House of Hapsburg must not be exposed to a spectacular failure, no material support was promised or supplied. Assured of conditional approval in Vienna, Napoleon III instructed his Ambassador in London to interest Palmerston in the scheme to prevent further encroachments by the United States, and

to open up a valuable market. With the Civil War waging to the north, he added, there was no fear of intervention, and Maximilian was a suitable candidate. King Leopold was begged to support the French *démarche* in London. Though neither England nor Spain displayed ardour, the three Powers signed the London Convention in October, 1861, undertaking to send ships and troops, renouncing in advance territorial advantages, and recognising the right of Mexicans to choose their government. Each signatory was to appoint Commissioners to assess claims and conduct negotiations. There was little optimism except among the refugees, and warnings reached the Archduke from various capitals. "What a lot of cannon shots it will take to set up an Emperor in Mexico," commented Metternich in Paris, "and what a lot more to keep him there!" Lord Russell, the British Foreign Secretary, was sceptical from the first, and Palmerston was much more interested in the old world, while Queen Isabella and her advisers would have preferred a Bourbon to a Hapsburg candidate.

The Archduke, with the steady encouragement of his wife, declared himself ready for all risks and sacrifices. His most ardent champion was Eugénie, who, annoyed by the caution of the English and the inertia of Spain, declared that if necessary France would shoulder the whole burden. Living in a world of illusions, the two couples took no account of the yellow fever on the coast, the toughness of Juarez, the absence of a Monarchist party and the frowns of Washington. A repulse at Puebla, on the road to the capital, caused consternation in Paris, but the dreamers of Miramar refused to despair. Reinforcements were despatched, and the commander proclaimed that he was making war on the Government, not on the people of Mexico. Warnings continued to pour in from many quarters, and when the Greek throne became vacant Russell advised King Leopold to sound his son-in-law, who contemptuously declined. When Puebla was taken in May, 1863, and Bazaine marched into Mexico City without opposition, the French Emperor, reported Metternich, wept for joy. Though Juarez remained full of fight and the country was far too large to corner him, the goal seemed within sight.

"I hope the whole of Mexico will soon follow the example of the capital," telegraphed the Emperor, "and summon you to regenerate the country. The Empress joins in congratulations." His enthusiasm stood out in sharp contrast to the reserve of Austria and England, where no desire was felt for an extension of French influence in the new world. Without a shred of evidence the Dictator continued to believe the assurances of Mexican exiles that the people would welcome a liberator, and at the end of 1863 he urged the Archduke to cross the water without waiting for solid guarantees of local support. He had no desire to lock up French troops in Mexico, now increased to 40,000, and hoped to withdraw the larger number as soon as the new ruler had created a native force. He had never been quite so enthusiastic as the Empress, and his fear of trouble with Washington increased as the chances of a victory for the North improved in the Civil War.

In January, 1864, the Archduke announced that he was only waiting for

the Emperor's consent to start for Paris, for the time had come to learn precisely to what extent France would pledge her aid. Arriving in March, they found the Emperor in excellent spirits on the strength of despatches from Bazaine. A new convention promised that 25,000 French troops would remain till local forces were available and the Foreign Legion stay on for eight years. Onerous demands for the payment of expenses and the repayment of a loan were accepted, since funds could be found nowhere else. A secret article insisted on by the Archduke, provided that French assistance should never fail whatever might occur in Europe. A Commission was established in Paris of French, British and Mexicans to represent the foreign creditors of the state. Once again Maximilian and his wife made the best impression on their hosts, and on parting Eugénie gave the Archduke a gold medallion with an image of the Madonna, adding "this will bring you luck." The Austrian Ambassador remained a pessimist. Even the Empress, he reported, was a prey to feverish excitement owing to the feeling of responsibility she had incurred. In reply to the guests' parting letter of gratitude the Emperor renewed the assurance that his support would never fail. Crossing the Channel on a courtesy visit the travellers found a more realistic atmosphere. Palmerston foretold that the burden would prove too heavy, and Charlotte's grandmother, Queen Amélie, exiled widow of Louis Philippe, exclaimed to the Archduke "they will murder you."

In April, 1864, after three years of discussion, a Mexican deputation bringing certain documents of adhesion arrived at Miramar, assuring the Archduke of "the unending love and unshakeable fidelity of a Catholic and monarchical people." When the host announced that he was ready to accept the crown there were cries "Long live the Emperor Maximilian. Long live the Empress Charlotte." A telegram was received from Paris once more pledging friendship and support. The strain had been too much for the sensitive Archduke, who left Miramar in tears while his stout-hearted consort maintained her dignity and calm. A brief visit was paid to Rome to receive the blessing of the Pope.

*To be continued.*

G. P. GOOCH.

### ALBERT CAMUS

ONE of the youngest authors ever to receive the honour, the French Algerian Albert Camus was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in the autumn of 1957. At the age of 43, he had behind him three novels, a couple of plays, and two book-length philosophical essays, as well as a number of more occasional writing. All of his major works have been translated into English.

Camus is an inspiring thinker. His thought has moved from a position in which man's condition in the world appeared ineradicably absurd to one in which an honourable passion for moderation seems to hold out most

hope. Talk of moderation often evokes suggestions of indifference or acquiescence; but this is not what Camus has in mind at all. By it, he implies a way of thinking which acts as a sharp corrective to excess, particularly to political excess committed in the name of ideology. In this light, moderation is seen not as the accomplice of *laissez-faire* but as the purest instrument of justice—the guarantor of equity. Fully to appreciate this idea, set out in his treatise *The Rebel*, it is best to return to Camus' early work, in which he develops his notion of the "absurd." His first writings were powerfully influenced by three factors: the French Resistance, his Algerian background, and his own sun-warmed precocious youth. The impact of the Resistance is most strikingly present in his book *The Myth of Sisyphus*, an interpretation of man's place in the world. An American critic Hannah Arendt has neatly préciséd the argument of this courageous youthful book. "For Camus," she writes, "man is essentially a stranger because the world in general and man as man are not fitted for each other; that they are together makes the human condition an absurdity . . . Man is essentially alone with his 'revolt' and his 'clairvoyance,' that is, with his reason, which makes him ridiculous because the gift of reason was bestowed upon him in a world 'where everything is given and nothing ever explained.'" Man's "revolt" against the universe does not originate in political thinking. Its sources are in that human discontent with the massive inertia of nature. Man instinctively longs to refashion this "sorry scheme of things entire" and to substitute for the kingdom of the ant a freer reckoning with necessity. In a like manner, man's "clairvoyance" is no special prophetic gift. It is just man's exceptional possession, amidst the unconscious and sub-conscious world of nature, of thinking unfettered by automatic reflex—his power of extra-personal curiosity. Thought is therefore a solitary phenomenon in the society of the universe. Man is lonely because of it. Because of man's possession of these unshared talents, the human condition, in relation to the cosmos, is that of a person sent to Coventry. The speech of the universe is non-human. The significance of this doctrine of the "absurd" is clearly associated with Camus' experience of the French Resistance. Without the operative law and custom of his own native land, man is indeed in an "absurd" position. The place of nature in Camus' scheme brilliantly reflects his sense of Europe, his sense of France, under German occupation. To fight without an organized country as one's base is to fight in the name of the "absurd." And yet, solely by this "absurd" condition man retains his *raison d'être*, his honour.

The Algerian landscape is potently pervasive in Camus' novel *The Outsider*, as a work of art his most successful story. Mr. Connolly has acclaimed this tale as a fine example of "classical pessimism," of an open-minded acceptance of life: of love, of the sun, of violence, of death. As with the poets of antiquity, Camus' story is certainly frank; and, as with them, it is often pessimistic. But the resemblance reaches no further. Virgil and Horace held civilized values, whereas the hero of *The Outsider* is an equable but callow modern savage.

Much of Camus' work is rendered invalid by the false image of normality which he seeks to establish in it. In *The Outsider*, a young man in Algiers,

learns of the death of his mother in a Home. He attends her funeral without sorrow, starts up an affair with a girl, agrees he will marry her if she desires it (though the word "love" has for him no meaning), shoots an Arab with whom he has no quarrel largely under the effect of the sun, is tried and sentenced to the guillotine, and says he cannot regret his action (he has never in his life regretted a thing). On the credit side, we must allow him fortitude and a respect for truth (he will not make a statement he does not understand or which appears unreal to him), and that *amor fati* which Nietzsche rated so highly. But where—pace Mr. Connolly—is Virgil's filial piety, Horace's reflecting prudence, or the focused erotic passion of Catullus or Propertius? Camus' story is Algeria, no doubt; but its moral colours, its living values are poster-thin compared with the Mediterranean ethos of the classical poets. *The Outsider* is a brave attempt to get behind the pharisaic mask of a certain aspect of morality. The weakness in the argument of the novel is that it takes this one aspect for the whole content of the moral life. But all morality is not pharisaic, as the poets of antiquity knew well enough. In seeking to remove an ethical excrescence, Camus has planed away the solid wood of a valid humane system of living. His "outsider" is a noble animal, nothing more. The classical hero *accepts* his fate; Camus' hero *rests content* with his because he has not the fund of mind to question the *status quo* of nature, the reflexes of instinct, the chain of cause and effect. This same fascination with intellectual supineness is apparent in Camus' admiration for Kafka. His résumé of one of the Czech Jew's novels and his comments upon it underline this interest of his. "In *The Trial*," writes Camus, "Joseph K- is accused. But he does not know of what. The lawyers find his case difficult. Meanwhile he does not neglect to make love, to eat and read his newspaper. Then he is judged. But the courtroom is very sombre. He understands little of what is happening. He supposes only that he is condemned. Sometimes he doubts his condemnation, and continues to live. A long while afterwards, two well-dressed and polite gentlemen seek him out and invite him to follow them. With the greatest courtesy, they lead him to a desperate-looking suburb, prop him up against a boulder, and thrust the knife into his heart. Before dying, the condemned man says only: 'Like a dog'." Then follows Camus' reaction to the story. "Clearly," he says, "it is difficult to speak of symbols in a work whose most perceptible quality is precisely its *naturalness* (my italics)." Shades of the Gestapo! Surely we should agree that this *naturalness* is representative only of a country under occupation, or one whose government functions by tyranny. But if tyranny and occupation are not indigenous social constants, then Kafka and Camus are placing before us false images of normality which do not express our general condition. The impact of the Resistance and of the German occupation is obvious here; and, for our own sakes, we must hope that these abnormal reflections of man's state have only a temporary validity about them.

Camus' two plays, *Caligula* and *Cross Purpose*, mirror their author's preoccupation with man in society deprived of justice or resident in a universe lacking meaning. The first deals with the monstrous crimes of an emperor who is determined to commit every kind of crime in order

to prove that he is superior to the gods and that there is no good or evil. The second takes as its theme the murder of a son by his mother and his sister, a murder the absurdity of which is heightened because the murderers do not know whom they are killing.

Back of Camus' vision of the world as a stage empty of value and meaning, a certain defiant shoot of life has withheld him from nihilism. This shoot can be regarded as possessing two attributes: an unconscious will to live or "animal faith," and a conscious sense of honour. "I have never been able to bring myself to despise the word honour, as many have done," Camus stated recently in an interview (*Observer*, Nov. 17, 1957), "because I have always known instinctively that honour is (like pity) that unreasonable virtue which takes over when justice and reason become powerless." This subconscious confidence and affirmation of human dignity find their most articulate expression in Camus' philosophic study *The Rebel*. The essence of its argument consists in a distinction between "revolution" and "rebellion." Camus envisages the first as a calculated plan to take over government and society: the second, as an instinctive gesture of protest against injustice. The former obviously requires the full machinery of party and programme: the latter, only a challenging act, whether by a group or an individual in defence of some other individual or group. "Revolution" is generally involved with policies of expediency or opportunism. "Rebellion" is primarily a moral matter — man's natural reaction to any outraged value.

According to Camus' way of thinking, "revolution" has been corrupted by ideological domination, just as political ethics have been rendered nihilistic by Machiavellian systems of power. Because of this corruption, "revolution" has ceased to be the avenging weapon of justice. It is no longer a humane protestation, but an instrument of party, propaganda, or the State. All ideological thinking disdains the idea of limits, of norms. Its contempt for the objectivity of law, and the *hubris* at the heart of it, makes it a demonological force. It can propose no ends without excess, because it lets no one criticize its means.

In contrast to this Camus regards "rebellion" as a corrective way of thought. It holds in mind no Utopian goals, but goes into action wherever injustice or indignity have been shown to man. It has no abstract programme to propound, but recognizes the nature of injustice (which it seeks to rectify) by the pain, violation, and offence which is occasions. Its only watchword is "moderation"; its only attack is directed against "excess." It is at this point that Camus' agnostic mood approaches closest to Christian thought. St. Thomas Aquinas foresaw conditions in which he considered revolt was justifiable; and Camus himself has emphasized the part which compassion must play as a motive-force. His latest novel *The Fall* introduces two further ideas discoverable in Christian thought, though the author does not associate them with it. The first of these is man's declension from a state of happiness, harmony, or grace; and the second, the twin notion of guilt and penitence. Like a number of other modern writers, Camus appears to be resorting to terms of speech and concepts of thought borrowed from religion without wishing to acknowledge their

derivation from the root-idea of God. It will be interesting to see how far these notions prove self-supporting and sufficient when isolated from their traditional source.

DEREK STANFORD.

## IMPRESSIONS OF TURKEY

THE Turks are not perhaps very captivating people at first sight. They lack the sharpness, the art-loving spirit, the gay sense of fiesta of the more westerly Mediterranean peoples. Turkish diet—involving much rice, concoctions of sour goat's milk, a vitriolic liquor called *raki*—is very much an acquired taste: Turkish pictorial art and theatre, like coffee, razor-blades, shaving-soap, writing-paper and many other near-essential commodities are *yok* (non-existent): Turkish music is weird, wailing and monotonous (although in its natural setting it has a certain power—marching along a narrow street on Republic Night amid a crowd of Turks waving Star-and-Crescent banners or blazing torches, you can feel from a simple, insistent tune played by a rustic piper an exaltation that links you with the primitive Mongol horseman back there on the Asiatic steppes). Then one finds the blue skies and the bluer mountains of the Turkish coasts—a Riviera-to-be—incomparably spectacular. And there is one thing for which the Turkish people must have one's admiration: their militant patriotism, which is leading them to make Turkey the most up-to-date state in the Moslem Middle East.

As everybody knows, Kemal Ataturk took over that fag-end of the Ottoman Empire, the ethnic rump of Anatolia, from 1922 to 1938, and began the Herculean task of modernising the nation which had been known as the "Sick Man of Europe." Ataturk's successors—Ismet Inönü and now Jelal Bayar (whose Democratic Party came to power in 1950) continued the work. Under the Ataturk, Inönü and Bayar regimes economic progress has been impressive. Immemorial agricultural methods among the peasantry (79 per cent of the population) have been subjected to the stimulus of modern methods of pest control and fertilizers, and there has been much pioneer work in irrigating and breaking into cultivation backward sections of the Anatolian plateau, with the result that the area under cultivation has increased from 7,216 million hectares in 1934 to 13,764 million hectares in 1955, *i.e.*, nearly doubled in 20 years. Steel production has increased from nil in 1923 to 188,028 tons in 1955; cement output from nil in 1923 to 816,000 tons in 1954; mining of copper from 2,240 tons in 1938 to 25,200 tons in 1954 (*i.e.* by 1,000 per cent in 15 years); of iron from 72,898 tons in 1938 to 586,200 tons in 1954 (*i.e.* increased 700 per cent). Turkey will prove to be rich in minerals, though nothing had been done in Ottoman times to exploit them. The Republic has inherited the back-breaking and, for the present, unrewarding task of providing the necessary communications, capital equipment and power installations to get them out of the soil and to use them to make Turkey an industrial country.

Thus the Turks now are in the throes of a capital investment programme. Here are some statistics of the growth of capital assets in Turkey:

	1923	1938	1955
Roads	11,393m.	25,838m.	34,176m.
Railways	2,320m.	4,586m.	4,895m.
Electric Power	—	212,891kwh.	1,584,000kwh.

The Turks have resorted little to inducing foreign investment to provide these things: until 1954 there were strict restrictions on the entry of foreign capital and the exit of profits (undoubtedly a reaction to the "Capitulations" policy by which the later Sultans sold out many of Turkey's resources to foreign exploiters). Most of these advances have been achieved by the Turks' own efforts and their own money. Everybody knows how Turkey has advanced under the Republic: less publicized is the self-sacrifice by which the Turks have achieved this. The answer is short in this business of *yok*. Go into a Turkish store and ask for coffee, razor-blades, writing-paper, chocolate, films, aspirins, motor-cycle spares and the answer is *yok*, which means, there isn't any. Butter and tea are semi-*yok*. It is disconcerting and annoying—but there is a reason for the current shortage of consumer goods. In short, this austerity exists because the government has forced the people to conserve all foreign exchange for absolute essentials.

One of the six principles of the Kemalist Revolution is Etatisme (the six are Republicanism, Democracy, Secularism, Nationalism, Reformism, and Etatisme, represented in Turkish political symbolism by six arrows pointing upwards and outwards). Turks have reconciled themselves to a principle that transcends party politics, to the idea that the State has the right to control and regulate the economy for the benefit of all the citizens—an idea that is often nothing but a pious hope in some countries but that is tenaciously adhered to in Turkey. Thus under the Etatiste principle, Turkish governments have assumed a rigid control of the flow of foreign exchange. This process has been achieved like this: the Turkish lira has been deliberately overvalued (T.L. 7.90 to the £, when one lira has the approximate buying-power of one shilling). Thus the Turks can buy essential foreign capital equipment cheaply with the foreign currency the nation earns. But how can the Turkish export-producer sell at the world-price when £1's worth of goods sold nets him only T.L. 7.90 (=8s.)? The answer is Etatism: the government buys from the producer at an economical Turkish price and sells the product—chiefly tobacco, raisins, wheat and cotton—at the lower, world price. The government makes up the difference, *i.e.* the nation as a whole pays. The nation pays so that the government can buy exportable crops: these are marketed entirely by the government, the foreign exchange comes into the government's hands and the government spends it on essentials. No Turk may take out of the country more than T.L. 100 (=£12 10s.). Foreign cars, cameras, gramophones, etc., are rarely seen around, even in the big cities, and then are chiefly possessed by foreigners. Contrast this situation with certain other Middle Eastern countries where American cars, German cameras, British radios are in lavish profusion. Yet where the currency is periodically

devalued, setting up a spiral of the most pernicious order—the rise in prices of foreign goods (hitting especially at the poor), the constant cap-in-hand approach to creditor governments, the accumulation of loans the next generation will have to pay off, the accumulation of their currencies in foreign hands and the consequent buying up of their resources by foreigners . . .

When you come to think of it, this self-discipline on the part of the Turks is in keeping with their history. The Turkish people have been noted for their solidarity and patriotism since way back: it is said that the Prophet himself advised his followers to acquaint themselves with the Turkish language, for the Turks had an imperial destiny. The Turks still have the powerful physique and aggressiveness of their Mongol forebears: Turkey was the only Middle Eastern nation which never had feudalism—the Turkish peasant has always been an independent cultivator, never a serf: and the Turks ruled over an area of the Balkans and the Middle East now comprising some 20, suspicious, tariff-ridden, intimidated little statelets, from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century (a span equal to that of the Roman Empire) which permitted religious toleration and preserved order therein. In the West we are inclined to regard it as axiomatic that the Ottoman Empire was a "bad thing"—but that is chiefly because we remember it in its decadence, a state protracted abnormally because of the West's policy of propping up the Sick Man against Russia. But before that: why, in the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566) the Turks ruled from Istanbul a multi-racial empire of 20 million people when the English numbered a mere four million. The Turks were to the Middle East what the Aztecs were to Mexico, or the Prussians to Germany or the Romans to the classical world. There are signs that this spirit has not left them. Renascent since Atatürk, the Turks have chosen discipline and austerity more than any other Middle Eastern people. *Yok* is annoying: but the roads, dams, hydro-electric stations and the factories are being built. One day, perhaps 15 or 20 years hence, Turkey with its 25 million people will be the power-house of the Middle East, and the spirit in which the Turks are denying themselves things now in order to attain that goal later is the thing which wins the visitor's admiration.

JOHN PATRICK BURY.

### MYTH AND THE DREAM OF FLYING

**A** SPORTSMAN often dreamed that he could not fire his gun—usually because the lock did not work. In waking life the sensations in his fingers and hand assured him that he had pulled the trigger. If these sensations, or images of them, were missing in the dream, he would seem to be trying to pull the trigger, and failing. A musician dreamed that, however hard he tried, he could not move the pedals of his organ. In waking life a stream of sensations from the resisting pedals, including kinesthetic sensations from his moving muscles and sinews, assured him of successful pedalling. He would seem to try and fail to pedal if these confirmatory sensations,

or their images, were absent during the dream. Seafield records these two dreams of *frustrated effort*, though not the suggested explanations, in *The Literature & Curiosities of Dreams*, 1865 (i, 283; ii, 9).

The waking walker is constantly assured of his progress by the flow of sensations from the resisting ground and his moving limbs. If these, or adequate images of them, are missing in a dream he will feel unable to walk. This may explain the dream in which the victim remains rooted to the ground in spite of his efforts to move.

In a dream of labouring through mire the available sensations, or images of them, may correspond to impeded rather than to completely frustrated endeavour. Christian's inability to get out when he reaches the margin of the Slough of Despond corresponds more closely to the dream of being fixed. Bunyan substitutes the burden on Christian's back for the absence of confirmatory sensations. He is, however, more concerned with allegory than with the actual nature of dreaming, nor does he necessarily conform to known types of dream. Seafield ends his work with a *Dictionary of Interpretations from Artemidorus and Others*. The dream of falling into a quagmire is interpreted, by a naive analogy, to foresee encounters with great obstructions. This suggests, though does not prove, the recognition of a typical dream. In its simplest form, in any case, the dream fixes the striving victim to the ground. This may happen if the confirmatory sensations, or their images, from resistant ground and moving limbs do not guarantee walking—or running.

The dream has other ways, often more pleasant, of conforming to the absence of sensations confirming movement. The writer dreamed that he was at one end of a corridor, and then at the other, without moving along it. This dream conformed to the absence of sensations confirming movement by a delusory change of position without moving. Visual images confirmed change of position; absence of sensations, or their images, characteristic of walking movements, denied any motion. The dream has an alternative delusion: If the dreamer *floats* erect in the air, sensations, or their images, received from resisting ground and moving limbs need not assure him that he moves. The absence of such guaranteeing sensations suggests a reasonable explanation of the floating dream.

The dream of being air-borne may be more like flying than skimming clear of the ground. A spread of references through literature suggests the frequency of the flying type of dream. The dreaming flier may float prone, he may shoot upwards into the air, or fly in other ways. Sir Humphry Davy, for instance, in one dream seemed "to become diffused in the atmosphere," then to float in it, and finally "found" himself "in the sky." The dream may elaborate the conditions of the flight. During his first float Sir Humphry found he had wings. Then, amid the galaxies he seemed to speak about the eternity of spirits to an "intelligent being." John Davy records this varied dream in his *Life of Sir Humphry Davy*, 1836, ii, 379f.

The *Dictionary of Interpretations* includes the "dream of being raised from the earth and flying in the air." The dreamer, the interpretation runs, will obtain much "praise and honour" if he flies high, and less if he flies low. This again suggests a naive analogy.

Dr. X, after the aeroplane carrying him had crashed, soon after the take-off, seemed to look down from a height of about 200 feet at his damaged body. He watched men rush to it—"wishing they would leave it alone." Then he moved through the air, quietly speculating about his direction until, after a "sort of retraction," he hovered over his body again. As he returned to waking consciousness he realized that sal volatile was being poured down his throat. This experience, with its suggestions of a spirit detached from its body, and able to survey events, is recorded in the *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research* (June, 1957, pp. 92-97), suspected of being an instance of ESP—extrasensory perception. The hovering in the air and the passage through it at least connect with the dream of flying. If Dr. X was conscious enough to dream, his memory of what would happen if he did crash might supplement the dream of being air-borne. The experience might be a dream of flying elaborated in one way, as Davy's dream was in another.

When the holy Fursey, during a trance, journeyed to Heaven, he watched evil spirits try to stop him. Angels, the Venerable Bede further relates, defeated their machinations (Eccles. Hist. Bk. iii, Ch. xix). During a passage entitled *Of the Force of Imagination in The Anatomy of Melancholy*, Robert Burton notes visions and "strange things of heaven and hell" told by recoverers from trance. These have been reduced, he adds, "to the force of imagination, and the devil's illusions." The former cause, however indirectly and inadvertently, hints at the promotion of myth by the dream of flying. The devil need not be invoked. Sleeping dreams and trance visions are closely enough akin to be taken together. Sir Humphrey Davy's flight is called a dream; the holy Fursey's visit to Heaven was regarded as a vision. The crash of Dr. X may indicate another condition promotive of dreaming or having visions.

The displacement was short in the Corridor Dream. During similar dreams the dreamer may be at one place and then promptly at a distant spot. Such dreams, which convert flying into rapid transport, have their suggestive analogues in transportation myths. In the Apocryphal *Bel and the Dragon* the angel takes Habakkuk by his crown, lifts him by his hair, and lands him in Babylon by a blast of breath. Robert Burton, in *A Digression of Spirits*, uses this remarkable transportation to illustrate Bodin's assertion that aerial spirits can transport bodies "with admirable celerity." Pythagoras and Apollonius, Burton adds, could so "remove themselves and others," and, again to illustrate Bodin's doctrine, "Philip the Deacon was carried away by the Spirit."

The melancholy of Jaques was "compounded of many simples"; any determinately recognized effect has a complex of causes. The lack of sensations, or of their images, that usually guarantee movement is, so the present suggestion runs, a significant characteristic of the causal complex responsible for the dream of flying. The simple dream of floating, and of instantaneous transportation conform most obviously to this suggestion. These may be the kernels of more elaborated dreams or visions, such as the holy Fursey's visit to Heaven. Such dreams or visions seem to have originated transportation myths. A rapid transportation dream, elaborated into angelic carriage, may well have originated the startling experience

ascribed to Habakkuk. Elaborated dreams of actual flying, such as the holy Fursey's, seem to have promoted mythical transportations.

In early days sleepers who dreamed of the departed were supposed to be visited; when they dreamed of being in distant places they were presumed to visit. This has a parallel in the experiences of Muhammed, apparently during trance. He was visited when Gabriel brought him the revelations embodied in the Koran: the meetings seem to have been more auditory than visual. He visited when he was carried by night, first to the temple at Jerusalem, then up through the seven heavens, and finally to the throne of God. Tradition may have assigned to him the companionship of Gabriel during his Night Journey. If being borne on the back of Borak was part of the original experience it is an interesting elaboration of the simple flying dream. Sir Humphrey Davy imagined wafting wings; Muhammed imagined a more sturdy, and for a human being a more natural, supporting carrier in Borak. *The Ebony Horse in The Thousand and One Nights* that bore the Persian Sage high into the air, and brought him back to ground, suggests a recognizable mythical counterpart of the dreamed Borak.

The dream, or vision, may elaborate the kernel of simple flying; myth may further elaborate the dream. The myth may be a simple transcript, as the holy Fursey's presumed visit to the skies may have substantially transcribed his vision. Gabriel's share in Muhammed's Night Journey, if added by tradition, is a palpable mythical elaboration. The dreamer's waking imagination, by implementing his recollections, may initiate a further mythical elaboration. It is tempting to suspect a distribution of the flying dream kernel through mythical transportations by a magic carpet. Pegasus may be a mythical counterpart of Borak, with its kernel in the dream of flying. His wings, however, like the winged sandals of Hermes, strongly suggest a mythical basis in the analogy of the flying bird. Many causes, doubtless, other than the dream of flying, contributed to transportation myths. Daedalus made wings of wax and feathers for himself and his son Icarus. Their winged escape from the Maze suggests a human desire to vie with the birds. The fate of Icarus, drowned because he melted off his wings by flying too near the sun, suggests a feeling of presumptuousness or danger underlying the desire. Dreams of flying may have helped the tempting analogy of the flying bird to produce even this apparently direct mythical analogue of avian flight. The bird analogy, however, seems pervasive in the Daedalian device. It also seems to dominate the traditionally winged angel. As Davy's dream shows, however, the avian wing can enter the myth via the dream. The dreamer, also, may project his own dream on to a mythical being.

*A Discourse of Angels*, with a preface by Geo. Hamond, was published in 1701. The author explains, on page 59, that angels "are commonly represented with Wings, with many Wings, to note their extraordinary swiftness." The propulsive wing has become a symbol of speed. The author continues, "Then, when Daniel began his Prayer the Angel was sent from Heaven, and before, or as soon as he had ended his Prayer, the Angel was with Daniel." This reference to *Daniel* 9:23 deduces the speed of angels from a vision. Such visions may have established, or helped to establish, the flight,ulti-

mately the supremely rapid flight, of angels, though the symbolic wing also hints distinctly at the associated avian analogy in the concept of these beings. The angel, so diagnosed, is not a direct product of the flying dream in which the dreamer himself is the transportee. The Daniel type of dream, however, may have helped dreams of being transported, including the dream of actual flying, to establish mythical transportations.

The dream, or vision, of being transported, including flying and simple floating, seems to be an effective cause of transportation myths. If this is so, and if the suggested explanation contains truth, the angelic carriage of Habakkuk, and other myths have arisen, at least in part, because sleepers, or the entranced, do not imaginatively reproduce a sufficiently complete reality. The mythical results include presumed separations of souls from bodies.

J. C. GREGORY

## EDUCATION AND THE ARTS IN ISRAEL

THE celebration of the Tenth Year of the State of Israel is being organized on a big scale with ceremonies all over the country, beginning at the end of April. One of the principal events is the dedication of a new University city in a south-western suburb of Jewish Jerusalem. That is fitting, because the basis of the amazing development of the country during the first ten years of the State has been the constant application of science to every aspect of the national life. This scientific knowledge flows from three institutes of higher education: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Technion (technology institute) of Haifa, and the Weizmann Institute of Science at Rehovot. The three were established in the days of the British Mandate for Palestine; but they have all been enormously expanded in the State of Israel.

The Hebrew University is the crown of the educational system of Israel, and provides the State with its leaders and civil servants, its lawyers and doctors, its teachers and administrators, its scientists and agricultural experts. When it was reopened in 1949, after most of its students and teachers had been engaged in the War of Independence, it had less than 1,000 students and some 200 academic staff. In the tenth year of the State it has nearly 4,000 undergraduate and 300 post-graduate students, and an academic staff of 600. Before 1949 it comprised only two faculties: one of the Humanities, which included the Institute of Jewish Studies and the Institute of Oriental Studies, as well as the general Humanities; and the other of the Sciences and Mathematics. It has added four faculties: Medicine, Law, Agriculture, and the Economic and Social Sciences. It is recognized as the principal school of Judaism in all its aspects; and the work of its archaeologists has revolutionized our knowledge of the land of the Bible and biblical and post-biblical history. Its teachers make a constant contribution to many other branches of knowledge by their research.

At the end of the War of Independence the University was deprived of its incomparable site, its fine buildings, its library with half a million books, and its open-air theatre, on Mount Scopus. The inauguration of the University on that site in 1925 by the late Lord Balfour, in the presence of representatives of the universities and academies of the world and a vast assembly of 7,000, was one of the most memorable occasions in the period of the British Mandate. Scopus is part of the ridge of the Mount of Olives to the east of the walled Holy City, which is Arab; and the only access to it from the Jewish city lies through two miles of Arab territory. In the first stage of the war the University buildings were heavily shelled; but during the first cease-fire in June, 1948, an agreement was made for the demilitarization of Scopus, which was placed under the protection of the United Nations. A hundred Jewish police and a few civilians occupied the University buildings and the Hadassah University hospital, and kept watch and ward. The Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan, signed in 1949, included an agreement in principle of "the resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and free access thereto." The intention was that the buildings of the University and the hospital should be available again for their proper purpose; and an Arab-Jewish committee was to work out the details for carrying the agreement into effect. That, however, was not achieved, and many efforts to reach a settlement failed. In 1954 the authorities of the University started to build a new University city on Givath Ram in Jewish Jerusalem, which is marked for both the civic and academic centres. By 1958 a great part of the city was built, and more than half the students were pursuing their studies in new spacious and splendidly-equipped lecture halls and laboratories. Appropriately the new buildings of the Hebrew University have for the most part been designed by graduates of the School of Architecture in the Haifa Institute of Technology. The University city is the most ambitious building undertaking in the country, and it is a happy augury that the University is to open a School of the Fine Arts. An English Jew of Birmingham has endowed the first chair.

The Technion at Haifa, whose original home is in the principal Jewish quarter of Hadar HaCarmel, has increased the number of its full-time students to 2,000. It trains the architects and engineers of every kind, civil, electric, chemical, and agricultural; and in addition it conducts a trade school for skilled workmen. Like the University it has acquired for its expansion a new site: 250 acres, magnificently placed on the wooded Carmel ridge. The new buildings are rapidly rising, and they include an auditorium which was given by English friends in honour of Sir Winston Churchill.

The Weizmann Institute of Science has grown up around the residence of the first President of Israel in a big village of the Plain of Sharon. It began with the Daniel Sieff Research Institute, which was created in the days of the Mandate by English and American friends of Dr. Weizmann. The Institute, which is engaged in both pure and applied research in many fields, chemistry, physics, cancer, etc., comprises some 200 scientific workers, many of them men and women of international distinction. It is equipped on the highest standards of any research institute in the world; and in recent

years it has been the centre for several international conferences of scientists. The opening of its Institute of Atomic Physics will be another part of the Tenth Year celebration.

Besides the three major institutes of higher learning, two other colleges have been established since 1948. The Bar Ilan University at Ramat Gan, a suburb of Tel Aviv, was founded by the religious Zionists, Mizrachi, on a religious basis. The staff and the students are observant of Jewish law, and courses are given both in Jewish and secular studies. At Tel Aviv the municipality has initiated courses of a university standard in the Humanities and in the sciences, particularly for teachers.

All the arts flourish in Israel, and, as in every other aspect of the national life, a remarkable creative energy and striving are manifest. Music is perhaps the most creatively developed and is loved by the whole people. Israel has a Philharmonic Orchestra, formed originally by the famous violinist, the late Bronislaw Huberman, with a view to gather in the land of Israel the best of the Jewish musical talents driven from Europe by Hitler's persecution. The orchestra has achieved an international reputation; and the most celebrated conductors in the world and the greatest instrumentalists are happy to direct it or perform with it. Music conservatoires have been founded in the principal towns; and an Academy of Music, including the leading composers and executants in Israel, flourishes. There is a large output of original compositions, songs, operas, symphonies, and every kind of chamber music; and a determined effort is made to combine the western and the oriental modes. The Festival of the International Society for Contemporary Music was held at Haifa in 1954. Recently a fine concert hall holding 3,000 persons was opened in Tel Aviv; another is to be built in Jerusalem, and the Jerusalem Conservatoire will be housed by the gift of an American friend in a worthy building.

The theatre in Israel has been highly developed since the early days of the Mandate. Two Hebrew companies, Habimah (meaning Stage) and Ohel (meaning Tent), produce a number of original plays and also the world's dramatic masterpieces in Hebrew. Like the orchestra they have toured in Europe and America. Habimah has its own large theatre building in Tel Aviv; and there is also in that cultural centre a Chamber theatre for more intimate performances. A ballet company of Yemenite dancers, recently formed, has already gained wide fame.

Painting and sculpture are earnestly pursued not only in the towns but in the collective and co-operative villages. All the modern schools and trends have their followers, and a distinctive Israel idiom has yet to be evolved. Israel artists have taken a worthy place in the Festival of the Biennale in Venice; and this year a representative exhibition of Israel painting and sculpture has been held in London under the auspices of the Arts Council of Britain. Two artists' colonies have been formed; one at Safed, the old holy city of the mystics in the hills of Galilee; the other in a village on the Carmel ridge, Ein Hod, south of Haifa. The Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts in Jerusalem, which was founded before the First World War, has been developed as a school of painting as well as of applied art. It conducts a valuable educational activity through the schools by the use

of its collection of reproductions of masterpieces and by special exhibitions. The three big cities each have their Museums of Art, which are built up by the gifts of friends, Jews and non-Jews, in all parts of the world.

Another form of culture must be mentioned because it is perhaps the most popular of all. That is the deep interest in archaeology and the ancient history of the Bible land. In every settlement where the newcomers dig and plough the land they are equally concerned to discover the past. The annual archaeological conference, held in different parts of the country, is a popular event. And local museums of archaeology are multiplied.

Lastly, a word must be said of the art of literature, which is intensively fostered in Israel. The Jews are traditionally the People of the Book; and they are certainly living up to that tradition in the national renaissance. Over 1,200 new works in Hebrew are published in Israel every year. Some indeed are translations from the great literatures of the world, but a large part are original works of poetry, fiction, history, etc. A remarkable output of encyclopaedias in Hebrew, touching many aspects of life and knowledge, is being published. And there can be few, if any, countries with such a high proportion to the population of good private libraries. The creation of the State has released creative faculties, both of those born in the country and of many of the immigrants. Everywhere one senses the consciousness of the renaissance of Jewish culture and of Judaism as a civilization. And among the Jews of the world Israel is recognized as the intellectual, spiritual and artistic centre.

NORMAN BENTWICH.

### ALBANIA IN CHAINS

INY Albania, the smallest and the most miserable and terrorized of Communist satellites, has been Moscow's only isolated satellite since Tito's expulsion from the Cominform (1948). Its 1,250,000 people, mostly illiterate and dirt poor, have been dominated by some 48,000 Communists, who in turn take their orders from the savage Premier Mehmet Shehu and the handsome Party chief, Enver Hoxha. Although the Communist Party Central Committee and the Government ordered the "complete abolition" of the rationing system on November 1 so that citizens of Communist Albania can now go shopping without ration cards for the first time in 12 years, actually things were going from bad to worse on the internal front. Dissension has been boiling up inside the Communist ruling group to the point where an open challenge to Kremlin-backed leaders in the key government posts by rebels against the stifling Soviet grip could become a distinct possibility. This much was certified to by the circumstances of the flight into Yugoslavia (on May 17, 1957) of the former Albanian Deputy Defence Minister Major-Gen. Panajot Pljaku. His flight took place against the background of the difficulties facing the party leaders by the Kremlin's sudden decision to choke off, for the

moment, their new campaign against Tito. Of all the satellites Tirana was the only one which did not ease up on Tito after Stalin's death; in fact, when Moscow made friends with Tito in 1955, Albania failed to make friends with the Yugoslav leader. Furthermore, whenever Khrushchev and Co. wanted to bare their teeth to Tito they let Dictator Hoxha denounce him, and then reprinted Hoxha's abuse in *Pravda*. This in turn has been most irritating to Tito who, personally, hates Hoxha. The resentment against the Kremlin's penetrating control of all aspects of Albanian life produced the flight of General Pljaku, a member of the Central Committee, who was a victim of the 1948 purge, but who emerged as Deputy in the Defence Ministry in 1955 when Hoxha was ordered to bend slightly toward the West at the orders of the Kremlin. In his new position he criticized most courageously the attitude and behaviour of the so-called Soviet "specialists and experts" running Albania's Army and industry. When his opposition began to embarrass Shehu and Hoxha he was discharged and re-assigned to the headship of the State Geological Institute, but there again he had difficulties with the Soviet supervisors over the uranium prospecting. His flight had serious repercussions in the Army circles; Deputy Chief of Staff Miyslin Peza was arrested (together with the wife and three sons of Gen. Pljaku). Peza was accused of helping Gen. Pljaku to run and for supporting him in accusations that the Soviets had been "plundering Albania."

These difficulties with the Albanian army actually led to the strengthening of Moscow's hold on Albania. The numbers of Soviet experts supervizing every branch of industry (including the plants where experts from East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland are supposedly in charge), and all branches and public institutions, have been increased. Swarms of Russians have turned this Balkan satellite into a veritable fortress, posing a threat to Western security through the Mediterranean and recently U.S. Sixth Fleet's devices detected submarines, believed to be the Russian craft based in Albania. The Soviet experts have dug bombproof submarine pens in the cliffs of Albania's Saseno island to accommodate 30 undersea craft, fortified and enlarged the Vlona naval base on the mainland, and constructed a network of five airfields for jet fighters and fighter bombers. These strategic investments are of real importance to the geopolitical planners of the Kremlin, although the Albanian army itself is not; it consists roughly of 21,000 troops in three under-strength divisions, and it is dismissed by Western intelligence experts as having no practical value as a military force. The Soviets have made additional investments in this bottom-of-the-pit satellite. Thanks to the Kremlin supervision, Albania has now a limited amount of industrialization, boasts of an appreciable growth of literacy and a native, Soviet-trained young intelligentsia. In a strip of Albanian territory, next to Yugoslavia, at least 500 Soviet engineers and technicians are reported developing oil reserves that may prove to be the largest in satellite Europe (except for Rumania's Ploesti fields). And on April 17, 1957, Moscow released Tirana from its obligations to repay Soviet credits totalling 422 million roubles; the USSR also agreed to assist Albania in working out a 10-15 year plan for economic development and

to render technical assistance. The rescinded obligations included all the Soviet credits granted Albania from the end of World War II up to the end of 1955; this accounted for 348 million of the 422 million roubles. The 10-15 year plan for economic development lays emphasis on agriculture, with a view to making Albania self-sufficient in grain production (hitherto the country relying on imports) and expanding the production of livestock, cotton, sugar beets, grapes and citrus fruits, tobacco and various industrial crops. But the agricultural production of the country has been lagging, mainly due to the continued pressure from Albanian authorities for collectivization; during 1956 563 new collectives were established bringing the total to 881, with 37,167 families.

Albania has become important to the Soviet over-all strategic plans in the area not only militarily but also as an important link in the network of Communist radio stations beaming programmes in Arabic to the Middle East: 30 minute programmes in Arabic, containing news, commentaries and musical items, are being broadcast three times a day from Tirana. Arab listeners have been told of Albanian support for Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia as well as for "Syrian resistance to Anglo-American pressure." The claims of the pro-Communist regime for the cultural advancement of the country's educational system have been strengthened by the opening of the first and only state university at Tirana on September 16, 1957. No reports were made, however, how many students enrolled in that institution although official claims have been that over 5,000 students are enrolled in "higher schools." Most Communist-trained Albanian youth, sons of faithful party comrades, had studied in the USSR or in other so-called People's democracies. But little has been heard of their opposition although refugees insist that elements exist among Albania's impoverished masses for Hungarian-type uprising. There will be no Poznan or Budapest rebellion in Albania; the gallows, jails, and forced-labour camps have taken their toll of the Albanian intellectuals. A similar situation exists in regard to religious conditions, and little has been reported lately about religious opposition. By murder and purges carried out in rapid succession the Communist regime has succeeded in penetrating the Moslems Church and has been trying to use it as a propaganda rostrum aimed at luring to Communism the Near East Moslem world. Although there is an apparent degree of freedom to practise religion, the Orthodox Church has also been deprived of its rightful leaders, who have been executed, imprisoned, and has been transformed, for all practical purposes, into government agencies. The Catholic Church has been crushed with a brutality without example even in the other captive countries. In spite of its small size and the insolence with which Hoxha and Shehu have to take their orders from the Kremlin both were able to render a personal favour to the present dictator Khrushchev. When Marshal Zhukov visited Albania in the fall, the warm treatment he received in Albania was really a well-staged build-up for a big let-down. An hour after the brawny Marshal returned from Albania he was removed as Defence Minister. Evidently the world had seen its last of Zhukov as a folksy visitor in Albania.

*University of Bridgeport, Connecticut.*

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK.

## ENGLAND'S FIRST AMBASSADOR TO MOSCOW

WHEN Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev made their sea journey to Britain they were repeating a much more hazardous trip made in the sixteenth century, when the very first Russian Ambassador to Britain set sail from Archangel. On that occasion the trip took four long months and came to a watery end off the Scottish coast with a shipwreck from which the Russian Ambassador was saved by the English captain—only to be captured and held to ransom by a band of Scottish wreckers. By an ironic turn of Fate the Englishman who then saved the Ambassador's life was the same man who, a few years before, had led an epic British trade expedition that first "discovered" Russia, and opened the way for the great London merchant concern known as the Muscovy Company.

Captain Richard Chancellor was one of three renowned English navigators appointed to command the three ships that "certain grave citizens of London" ordered to be "prepared and furnished out for the search and discovery of the northern part of the world, to open a way and passage for our men for travel to new and unknown kingdoms." The three ships were *Bona Esperanza*, commanded by Sir Hugh Willoughby, *Bona Confidentia*, command of Captain Cornelius Durfoorth, and Chancellor's *Edward Bonaventure*—the largest of the three. Planned under the supervision of wily old Sebastian Cabot, Grand-Pilot of England, according to a report of the time it was the best equipped fleet to sail out of an English harbour: each of the ships was fully victualled for 18 months, and among other innovations the keels were fitted with lead sheets as protection against worms eating into the oak. News of the expedition's bold aims had spread, and when the three ships sailed from London docks, crowds of cheering people crowded the banks of the river. At the Palace of Greenwich, then the seat of Edward VI's Court, members of the Privy Council and courtiers stood waving, and in return the ships fired a salute. After calling at Harwich, the fleet set off across the North Sea for Norway. Alas for their high hopes a fierce tempest soon separated the three ships. The *Bona Confidentia* went down with all hands, and though Willoughby's ship managed in due course to reach the Murmansk coast the ill-fated commander and his surviving crew all died of cold and hunger.

Only Richard Chancellor, in the more solid *Edward Bonaventure*, managed to reach the agreed meeting place of Vardo on the coast of Norway. After waiting there a week or so he decided that he would have to proceed alone, remarking "a man of valour could not commit a more dishonourable part than for fear of danger to avoid and shun great attempts—I will bring that to pass which was intended or else die the death." So the *Edward Bonaventure* resumed her voyage into the unknown, and soon in his log book (another of Cabot's innovations) Chancellor was recording arrival at "a place where there is no night at all but a continual light and brightness of the Sun shining upon a huge and mighty sea."

At last the ship came into the White Sea and a landing was made at a spot where the port of Archangel now stands. Here Chancellor made his first contact with the Russians, sailing up to a small fishing boat whose occupants were amazed at the size of the ship. Not surprisingly the fisher-

men were at first terrified, expecting all manner of tortures, but the English officers expressed their peaceful intentions by signs and gestures. Soon the fishermen went off and brought back a large number of their compatriots who all, according to Chancellor, agreed to trade with the visitors provided permission was given by their Czar. At that time the Czar was none other than the famous Ivan the Terrible. Whatever his faults he welcomed the possibilities of trading with Britain, and as soon as he heard of Chancellor's landing he sent an envoy to conduct the British merchants to Moscow. In those days travel was an arduous process, and long before the envoy could reach the visitors Chancellor was fuming, convinced that some scheme was afoot to thwart his aims. He had not come all that distance just to be kept hanging about on the edge of the White Sea. He would, he declared, lead his own expedition overland to Moscow. In this manner, using borrowed "sleds," Britain's first somewhat unconventional trade delegation made its way towards Russia's capital. No doubt they would have reached there somehow, too, but by good luck, *en route*, they encountered the Czar's messenger who handed to Chancellor "letters written with all courtesy and in the most loving manner that could be: wherein express commandment was given that post-horses should be gotten for me and my company without any money."

In great triumph Chancellor completed his journey of some 1,500 miles and arrived in Moscow, where he was feted by the Russians and warmly welcomed by the astute Czar. During his stay in the capital Britain's first trade "ambassador" wrote down a detailed report, later presented to Queen Mary, in which he noted that Moscow was as big as London, though not as beautiful. "Likewise the other towns which I visited were built out of order and with no handsomeness; their streets and ways are not paved as ours; the walls of their houses are of wood; the roofs for the most part are covered with shingle boards." Among other things, Chancellor noted an aspect of Russia which will be remembered by many British sailors of the wartime convoys—namely the intense cold. "Our mariners, in their going up only from their cabins to the hatches had their breath oftentimes so suddenly taken away that they oftsoons fell down as men very near dead, so great is the sharpness of that cold climate." As might be imagined, his arrival did not please rival merchants, particularly the Hansa (German) merchants who had already established themselves in Novgorod. But despite their intrigues and protests the British leader was able to bring back to London an all-important letter from the Czar, "written in characters much like the Greek . . . in paper with a broad seal hanging at the same." In this, Ivan wrote: "If you will send one of your Majesty's council to treat with us your country's merchants shall have their free mart with all free liberties through my whole dominions to come and go at their pleasure, without any let, damage, or impediment." Queen Mary, who had by then succeeded Edward VI, at once conferred a royal charter on Cabot and his group, who then became the Muscovy Company—a trading corporation which was, in its style and scope, a forerunner of the East India, Hudson Bay and other famous British companies.

Chancellor's achievements were, of course, gratefully acknowledged, and

while the Muscovy Company was fitting out a great fleet of merchant ships, he was once again sent off in the *Edward Bonaventure* to continue and extend the negotiations which he had so triumphantly opened. Once again he sailed into the White Sea and made the journey to Moscow, and was again warmly welcomed. On this occasion, however, he was able to get down to practical matters, and during a stay of several months he made arrangements for establishing several marts, or markets, for English goods. In July, 1556, he set out from Archangel on the voyage home, and this time he brought with him an important and very unusual passenger—none other than the first Russian Ambassador ever to be sent to England. It was not until four months later that the *Edward Bonaventure* reached the coast of Scotland and there, laying to anchor off Pisligo, the ship was broken up to pieces. In a desperate effort he managed to get the Ambassador and members of his party into a small boat, but the attempt to reach safety was thwarted by the tempestuous sea. The puny boat was overturned and Chancellor and all its occupants drowned—with one exception. By a trick of Fate, the only survivor was the Russian Ambassador! And he was "rescued" by a band of Scottish wreckers. For several months he was held to ransom by these men, but in February, 1557, on the intervention of emissaries of the Muscovy Company, he was released. All was well that ends well, for, according to a contemporary description, Russia's first ambassador to Britain finally reached London escorted "by the merchants adventuring for Russia, to the number of one hundred and forty persons, towards the city where by the way he had not only the hunting of the fox and suchlike sports showed him, but also by the Queen's commandment was received and embraced by the right honourable Viscount Montague, sent by her grace for his entertainment. He entered through Smithfield Bars and on the five and twentieth of March (the day twelvemonth he took his leave from the Emperor his master) was most honourably brought to the King and Queen's Court as Westminster."

DENYS VAL BAKER.

### NIETZSCHE AND THE NINETIES

IN Mount's Bay the dead body of John Davidson, the poet, was found by some fishermen. He had been murdered by Friedrich Nietzsche. Such was the verdict of R. A. Scott-James writing in one of the London Dailies. Actually, however, Davidson had taken his own life. Le Gallienne had called John Davidson "the greatest of all the poets in the Nineties," and the *Westminster Gazette* had stated, "there is no truer poet in England than Mr. John Davidson." Yet his writings yielded little money. Like most poets he remained a poor man. His only reliable income was a Government pension of £100, hardly enough to support himself and his family. One day he left their home at Penzance never to return. Harassed financially, haunted by the bitter pain of failure in his semi-metaphysical

mission, he had written in *The Testament of John Davidson*:

"I felt the time had come to find a grave;  
"I knew it in my heart my days were done.  
"I took my staff in hand. I took the road,  
"And wandered out to seek my last abode."

Davidson was not a disciple of Nietzsche, but he had a genuine affinity with the philosopher-poet. The latter's influence is traceable in almost all the ten books published by Davidson during the Nineties and quite obvious in the books published afterwards. Nietzschean ideas were adopted because they harmonized with his proclivities.

If we disregard the trifling references to Nietzsche in *Keynotes*, a book of tales by George Egerton (*i.e.* Mrs. Mary Chavelita Clairmonte), it was Davidson who in *Sentences and Paragraphs* (1893) gave the first critical account of his teaching. This slender volume contains about 20 aphorisms from his works. Davidson preferred to reject all existing philosophies, including that of Nietzsche. Yet one has to agree with Holbrook Jackson when, in his book *The Eighteen Nineties*, he wrote: "He learnt more from Nietzsche than did any other poet of the time." And Davidson himself acknowledged Nietzsche as the most powerful mind of recent times. So we find the English poet accepting practically most of Nietzsche's cardinal ideas, such as the will-to-power, class morality and *amor fati*. The opinions of these two iconoclasts agree on socialism, government, woman, sin, asceticism and Christianity.

Both men were sons of the Manse, grown up in an atmosphere of piety, and both ended as followers of Lucretius who wrote: "And so religion is cast beneath men's feet and trampled, and victory raises us to heaven." According to Davidson: "The world is sick of Christendom. Gods and God are man's mistake"; and Nietzsche's verdict was: "Christianity, its God, and everything in it, is hostile to Life." Finally, each of the two, valiantly beating against the locked door of an unknown "reality," attained to unity with a subconscious universe by raising himself through poetry above experimentation and ratiocination. Each was enclosed in a completely solipsistic world. The self-exaltation of Nietzsche made him state: "I have given to men the deepest book they possess, my *Zarathustra*." And Davidson boasted of one of his own books: "This is the most profound and original of English books and the most helpful."

Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison, an Edinburgh Professor, was a Christian theist; one of his students wrote "he has given to the idea of God a profound and liberalizing interpretation." Seth did not welcome novel ideas in philosophy, and he attacked Nietzsche's doctrine. In the *Contemporary Review* he set out "to give a coherent account of Nietzsche's main ideas in their historical setting," dismissing them as "unworthy of serious discussion and himself largely a study in mental pathology." He deals thoroughly with the 10 years 1865-1875 when Schopenhauer and Wagner were the dominating influence on Nietzsche. After 1876 Nietzsche adopted a negative attitude to all the most characteristic Schopenhauerian doctrines. He changed the slogan *Wille zum Dasein* to *Wille zur Macht*. His passionate aversion to Christianity is considered by Seth to be a relatively justifiable

protest against the ascetic purely negative strain present in primitive Christianity and in the mediæval church, but Seth holds that "Christianity is to be judged by its total effect upon the history of civilization; that Christianity appears as the greatest agent the world has known in the spiritualization of desire; that Nietzsche's polemic, however apposite to certain historical phases of Christianity, seems somewhat belated at the present day." There follows an attack on Nietzsche's scorning the "green-grazing happiness of the herd dreamt of by shopkeepers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen and other democrats." Nietzsche's insistence on the natural inequality of men is criticized. As to the magnificent "blonde beast" roaming wantonly in search of victory and prey, the ultimate resort is to shoot at sight. Finally Seth states that Nietzsche's theory of knowledge, with the denial of any objective standard and its substitution of the beneficial for the true, was anticipated in Plato's *Theaetetus* and that the Eternal Recurrence was merely an echo of the doctrine of the Pythagoreans.

Internationally known as a distinguished man of letters, especially as the author of *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, Havelock Ellis tried to teach "the supreme art of living." In his excellent monograph *The Eighteen Nineties* Holbrook Jackson pointed out that the realism of the Nineties contributed towards greater frankness in literature. The various articles Ellis published in *The Savoy* during 1896 were his contributions towards such greater frankness. The three articles dealing with Nietzsche were the first long and serious attempt to assess Nietzsche's philosophy as a whole. Ellis was a clear-eyed sober critic who exposed all the weak points of the man who "had no system" and who was "reckless of consistency"; but he was the doughtiest champion of all that is best in Nietzsche. "He remains in the first rank of the distinguished and significant personalities our century has produced."

Ellis approached the subject of Nietzsche not with the cautious attitude of a learned, conservative, jaded, academic scholar, nor with the dictatorial attitude of the literary critic swayed by the prevalent fashion of æsthetic standards. According to him *Wagner in Bayreuth* ended Nietzsche's first period. "In substance and form Nietzsche's work was unquestionably sane; it represents, with much enthusiasm, the best that was known and thought in Germany a quarter of a century ago. His opinions on Wagner and Schopenhauer, on individualism and democracy, the significance of early Hellenism for moderns, the danger of an excessive historical sense, the conception of culture less as striving after intellectual knowledge than as that which arouses within us the philosopher, the artist, and the saint—these ideas, wild as some of them seemed to his contemporaries, have now largely permeated European culture."

Ellis stressed the importance of what he terms Nietzsche's second or middle period between 1877-1882 when "the main current of his thought expanded to its fullest extent." The books produced during that period (*Menschliches-Allzumenschliches*; *Morgenröthe*; *Die Fröhliche Wissenschaft*) seemed to Ellis to represent the maturity of his genius. "In these *pensées* Nietzsche shows himself above all a freethinker, emancipated from every law save that of sincerity. During the period that began in 1883

with *Also sprach Zarathustra* the keenly reasoned and piercing insight of the earlier Nietzsche disappeared and gives way to "a shimmering stream of golden phrases with which he has intoxicated himself and tries to intoxicate us." "Now he attached extraordinary importance to his own work; this self-exaltation increased and he came to regard himself as the incarnation of the genius of humanity. Finally a period of hallucinatory delirium led on to a complete dementia. Nietzsche was by temperament a philosopher after the manner of the Greeks. In other words, philosophy was not to him, as to the average modern philosopher, a matter of books and the study but a life to be lived. It seemed to him to have much less concern with 'truth' than with the essentials of fine living. His 'realism' was simply a vigorous hatred of all dreaming that tends to depreciate the value of life. He knew that a man's philosophy, to be real, must be the inevitable outcome of his own psychic condition. It is a point that philosophers have never seen. Perhaps Nietzsche was the first, however hesitatingly, to realize it. We have to recognize a diversity of moral ideals. Every man must be his own moralist. Nothing is more profoundly dangerous than, with Kant, to create impersonal categorical imperatives after the Chinese fashion."

During the Nineties these three, Davidson, Seth and Ellis were the outstanding English writers on Nietzsche. To quote Holbrook Jackson: "The Eighteen-Nineties were the decade of a thousand 'movements.' People were convinced that they were passing not only from one social system to another but from one morality to another, from one culture to another, and from one religion to a dozen or none." Thus the Nietzsche-seed sown fell into good ground. Soon it became evident that his doctrines called forth either fierce denunciation or passionate admiration. It was a consolation to many, even in respectable reviews, that he went mad, and that, of course, settled the matter. What could a madman teach us? On the other hand Erwin McCall dedicated his periodical *The Eagle and the Serpent*, "to the Philosophy of Life enunciated by Nietzsche, Stirner, Thoreau and Goethe." More than sixty articles by commentators and critics were published in England during this decade. Among the mass of material Havelock Ellis's three articles in *The Savoy* seem to be the best essay between 1890-1900. Keenly critical, well balanced and based on robust commonsense, it might even be used as the basis for a re-assessment of Nietzsche's philosophy.

M. A. MORLAND

### GERMAN LABOUR RELATIONS

FOR the past 10 years co-determination—a form of compulsory management-employee control—has been operating increasingly in German industry. In theory its objective has been the tangible realization of true industrial democracy. In practice it appears to have achieved for German workers little more than a legal system of sharing responsibility; and in this respect it is neither unique, nor as advanced as

certain individual experiments conducted elsewhere, for example the John Lewis Partnership. The basic idea is equal partnership of capital and labour in the *management* of an enterprise. It was introduced in the Ruhr steel plants in 1947, when these were taken over by British Occupation Forces, and maintained, extended and enforced—mainly because of trade union pressure—in 1951. Today four acts regulate the participation of work people in management. The first Act of 1951, applying to the coal and steel industries, requires a labour manager—as representative of the workers—to be appointed to the board of management, on which he takes his turn as chairman. The works Constitution Act of July, 1952, requires all firms with five or more regular employees to set up works councils, and all firms of 100 or more employees to establish an economic committee composed of an equal number of management and employee members to act as an advisory council on management and economic problems within the firm. There is also provision for an assembly of all employees which receives quarterly reports from the works council and may make proposals to it; and a general council in undertakings consisting of several establishments. There is provision also under this act for all joint-stock companies (except those in the mining and iron and steel industries and some small units) to have one-third of the board of supervision elected by employees, who will enjoy the same rights as shareholders. Thirdly, there is the Representation of Public Servants Act of August, 1955, applying to all officials, salaried employees and workers employed by the Federal Administration, by public corporations, institutions and foundations and by the Federal courts. Finally, an act of August, 1956, supplements the first act in respect of the extension of co-determination to holding companies producing coal, iron and steel. How does co-determination actually work out in practice? How far is it effective in its aims? In a foreword to an interesting survey—"Co-determination in the German Steel Industry"—Mr. Frederick Harbison, Director of the Industrial Relations Section of the Department of Economics and Sociology, Princeton University, writes: "At first glance, co-determination appears to strip management of all unilateral authority to make decisions in every aspect of business management. Under the Co-determination law, as it applies to the steel and coal industry, labour is given equal representation with the owners of the enterprise on the board of supervision. In addition, the law provides for appointment of a labour director on the board of management with nominal authority, status and pay equal to the technical and economic directors. The architects of the co-determination legislation clearly intended that the representatives of labour should have an equal voice with the representatives of the owners in the formulation of all policies of the enterprise as well as continuous participation in day-to-day implementation of such policies. Matters which had always remained within the exclusive authority of owners and managers, such as procurement and allocation of capital, market and price policies, accounting procedures, plant location and production methods were to be subject to joint determination."

It should be explained that, unlike a British board of directors whose members frequently combine directorial and management functions, a

German company's supervision board, in accordance with that country's company structure, has strictly limited supervisory powers, such as the authorization of large expenditure, dividend declaration and the engaging of certain key personnel, including the members of a board of management, who really determine day-to-day management policy. The third man appointed to the board of management, the labour director, unlike a labour or personnel director in Britain, is in fact a representative of the workpeople, nominated by the union in consultation with the Company's works council. Thus while enjoying the confidence of those he represents, he acts as a fully fledged member of the board, having an equal voice in all its decisions, but concerned primarily with employee relations and welfare. The higher supervisory board, on the other hand, is normally composed of 11 members or more, five of whom are chosen by the owners, and five by the employees. The eleventh man is elected by the other ten.

The composition of the worker's representation is curious—indeed tantamount to an admission that there is a shortage of rank and file members competent enough to serve on the board, or capable of being trained to serve on it. In consequence, only two of the five employee representatives (one manual and one non-manual worker) are nominated by the works council, one is nominated by the trade union organizing the majority of workers in the undertaking, one by the federation to which this union is affiliated, and one—the independent member—by the union. The net result is, as the biennial report of the German Trade Union Federation for 1954/5 shows (in connection with the composition of supervisory boards in coal, iron and steel undertakings). Out of 574 workers representatives, only 234 were employed in the firms concerned and elected by their works councils, 237 were nominated by the appropriate trade unions, in consultation with the works councils, and 103 were so called "further" (independent) members, coming from a wide selection of professions and other occupations. Strange though this may sound, it is not entirely without reason. The jobs required men with a knowledge of steel company problems and a combination of executive and leadership talents. In the early years of post-Nazi period, the decimated ranks of labour were not blessed with an abundance of persons combining these talents. Accordingly, less qualified people, such as men with prominent names in the Labour Movement, journalists, friendly city officials, and even retired businessmen had to be called to fill vacancies on the labour side. Lack of qualified personnel was indeed a major problem which the labour side faced in implementing their co-determination rights.

A problem of a different kind is the position of the labour director representing the interests of workpeople and simultaneously discharging his duties as one of three top executives in a company. He must perform two masters, an anomalous situation which could hardly arise on the board of a nationalised industry which may have one or more ex-trade union leaders on it serving full-time, but who would have been obliged to resign union office prior to accepting a board position. It may well be, of course, that we are merely less formal than the Germans. The very qualities that make a union leader—executive talent, leadership ability and dedication to the cause—qualify him also for such a post as, for example, director of

personnel on the board of a nationalized industry. It would be interesting to know whether the more formal arrangements under co-determination in Germany meet with Professor Cole's demand that "the rank and file workers must be allowed a share in deciding under whose orders and supervision their daily work is to be done." I doubt it. Especially since Professor Cole contends that "if they (workpeople) fulfil their duties as business directors, they cannot at the same time effectively represent the workers."

Nor would Professor Cole approve, one suspects, of the practice of "horse-trading" found common in the 10 steel companies studied by Mr. Michael Blumenthal.\* Briefly, this implies that as each of the three directors on the management board has a *de jure* right to participate in all decisions "there is a keen awareness of the interdependence arising from joint responsibility and accordingly considerable emphasis on the need for working together, along with a strong desire to find a mutually satisfactory working relationship." That is where "horse-trading" comes in. "You keep out of my affairs and I'll keep out of yours. You agree to my proposals for a new employee clubhouse, and in return I shall not interfere with your investment plans." Our commercial director, questioned by Mr. Blumenthal on the workability of joint deliberation by the management board, commented: "Relations on our board of management have been excellent. In the six years of operation under co-determination, we have never had a formal vote. Actually we aim to be like the British Cabinet, which hasn't taken a vote in over a hundred years . . . Obviously, we have disagreements . . . we frequently come into the meeting with different ideas and these have to be thrashed out. The labour director has the interest of the workers at heart, and has to get the most he can for them. While it is always apparent that he is on their side, we can work together and generally arrive at some compromise even on issues where we differ fundamentally . . ."

Inevitably, the situation could arise when a labour director dependent on the worker's confidence is under pressure to strive for higher and higher wages in good times—and to resist necessary cuts in bad times. In fact gross hourly pay in the iron and steel industry has shown an increase from 116.3 p.f. to 234.2 p.f., or about 102 per cent during 1948-1955, the period in which co-determination has been in operation.

The average increase in all other industries during the same period was 78 per cent. Yet some of these other manufacturing industries, notably metal fabricating, chemicals and textiles showed a more marked improvement in productivity than iron and steel.

Other major findings arising out of the enquiry into co-determination in the German steel industry can be summed-up as follows:—

1. The selection of qualified labour representatives for the supervisory board was not easy.
2. Whenever voting splits occurred on the supervisory board, they were confined to the five members of the labour side.

\* Of Princeton University—speaking at a symposium at the 8th annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

3. Horse-trading was just one of several techniques used for compromising conflicting views.
4. The labour director was constantly faced with personal, conflicting loyalties. A company's success depended very much on him.
5. The level of earnings in the steel companies was more than in comparable non-co-determination industries; prices tended to rise accordingly, earnings were not apparently increased output.
6. Expenditure on voluntary social benefits increased considerably under co-determination.
7. The labour director was often successful in improving employee-management communications, rationalizing internal wage structures.
8. There was direct and indirect evidence that the incidence of strikes and work stoppage declined under co-determination.

The conclusions drawn by the author of the report tended to be general but important as a guide to anyone interested in the concept of co-determination and its application. It appears to be a peculiarly German phenomenon which developed only because of a particular historical and environmental setting. In the steel industry it proved to be much less radical than expected. It did not disrupt the enterprise nor ruin the industry. Management did not have to relinquish all or most of its prerogative; work-people did not achieve the power they hope for. In short, co-determination did not solve as many problems as predicted nor create as many as were prophesied.

WILFRED ALTMAN

#### BLUEBELLS

*We, who must love the Spring a little more  
 Each year as though our thinning blood could feel  
 The sun's return more keenly, have gone out  
 Together this sharp day of windy sun  
 To gather in the rain-knocked bluebell sheaves  
 That last night's gale bent over; one by one  
 We lift their cold green stems as tenderly  
 As though they pulsed with human life and give  
 Full reverence to these ephemeral  
 Ambassadors of beauty, knowing that  
 Worship and love are one and equally  
 Strong obligations laid upon our spirits.  
 Who in the wind and rain of this racked world  
 Must strive to mend the broken and employ  
 Our little strength as priests for all that is  
 Simple and clean and born of light and joy.*

JOHN BARRON MAYS

# LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

## PEACE IN EUROPE

Dr. Hermann Lutz actively opposed the Hitler regime and now lives in the United States. He has devoted his scholarly mind to the vocation, as it were, of propagating the cause of unity between Germany and France as an essential basis for European peace. In the present book he sketches the history of those two countries from the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 to the beginning of Hitler's Chancellorship in 1933. Not unnaturally he suffers from something like a complex about the relations of the two countries, and even launches what he calls a "grand nightmare," the fear of an accommodation between Western Germany and the Soviet Union as the means to the reunification of Germany. It is not obvious that any western German would be likely to accept such an expedient. "Reunification" under Russia would be tantamount to a sort of suicide-pact such as no level-headed student of affairs could imagine as falling within the bounds of practical politics. Certainly no-one can take the idea seriously so long as Chancellor Adenauer is in control of Western Germany, for he happens to be a devout Roman Catholic sworn to justify the Soviet's diagnosis of his Church as enemy number one to Communism. But one can understand how the author's horror of the present century's history and the central role played in it by the tragedy of Franco-German relations has driven him to postulate an urgent end to that tragedy. If a Russian bogey helps him to that excellent end, there can be no complaint. Certainly the thesis that a closing of the Franco-German cleavage, achieved under what he regards as the moral leadership of the United States and in association with Great Britain and the United Nations, invites no criticism, and is the more admirable because it is presented with overwhelmingly adequate historical documentation.

The book is aptly dedicated to "all those who are striving for a permanent reconciliation of the French and German peoples as the indispensable foundation for Western European Unity." The author will be remembered for the public appeals he made in 1924 and in 1927-28, made by him as a German to British opinion, which failed in their purpose. He now appeals as a citizen of the United States to the English-speaking world in a cognate cause, which can now hardly fail. It was not till 1948 that he left Germany and devoted his subsequent life to historical research aimed exclusively to the end of peace. His reward is already great.

George Glasgow  
*German-French Unity: Basis for European Peace.* By Hermann Lutz. Henry Regnery Company, Chicago. \$5.00.

## AUSTRIAN PROBLEMS

Mr. Gordon Shepherd has written an informative and interesting book on Austria showing historical understanding and critical observation. He finds that the Austrians have only now acquired a strong national feeling and a marked sense of distinctiveness from the Germans. The experience of Nazi tyranny has certainly worked in this direction. The author rejects the widely held shallow views of the "Austrian character" and tries to replace them by more objective ones. His historical studies also induced him to revise the equally widespread opinions denigrating the former Austria, such as the view that it was a dungeon of oppressed peoples or that its rulers were mainly guided by dynastic egoism. Mr. Shepherd thinks it arguable that the 1939-1945 war would never have occurred if Austria-Hungary had not been destroyed. I should add that a very great proportion of the democratic Slav politicians from the territories of the former Empire, who had once known it, now regard its destruction as the greatest disaster which has befallen their peoples. During the war Milan

Hodza, the last Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, published a plan for restoring the community of the Danubian nations in a federal form, but Dr. Benes preferred the opposite policy and thereby brought about the subjugation of these nations by the Soviets.

The author gives an instructive picture of the vicissitudes of new Austria. His story of the resistance movement contains new information. In my opinion, however, the breakdown of democracy in the first republic was less due to the parliamentary inexperience of the politicians, as the author thinks, than to the brutalisation of certain sections through the war, the violent party strife, the proletarization of the middle classes through inflation, and most of all to the indescribable economic catastrophe brought about by the hacking to pieces of the former wide economic unity and the extreme economic nationalism of all the new national States. The author is well-read in the literature on Austria and has been eager to collect first-hand information, but he seems not to have read Eduard Ludwig's *Oesterreich's Sendung* (1954). Through his position he had a unique opportunity of knowing the leading men intimately. His book is written with great impartiality, and shows how much the constant intrigues of the leading politicians against one another contributed to the downfall of democracy and the triumph of the Nazis. Mr. Shepherd should further have used the memoirs of Sir Walford Selby, British Ambassador in Vienna, who has shown that Lord Vansittart against the instructions of the Cabinet, which Selby followed, encouraged the aspirations of the Nazis in regard to Austria.

FREDERICK HERTZ

*The Austrian Odyssey*. By Gordon Shepherd. Macmillan. 30s.

#### JEW AND CHRISTIAN

This annual publication of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies, at Seton Hall University, is a bold and laudable attempt to resume the dialogue between Christians and the Jewish people in a new spirit. This dialogue reaches as far back as Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and was continued in the Middle Ages with far too much acrimony. Today it is carried on in a spirit of charity and understanding. The experience of persecution suffered in common and the threat to the Judaeo-Christian heritage of the West have led European and American scholars to examine the implications of the dictum of Pope Pius XI: "Abraham is called our father. Spiritually we are Semites." Many and various are the fields of knowledge which the bridge endeavours to span: the Jewish tradition is compared with the Christian; temporal relations of Christians and Jews are discussed; the study of ancient and contemporary thought in theology, philosophy, history, sociology, literature, and the arts is undertaken to gain a deeper understanding of what is in common. To this second volume of the series Father Oesterreicher, a native of Austria, Director of the Institute and well-known author of *The Walls are Crumbling*, has contributed a study of the Community of Qumran. In a penetrating and arresting essay "The Word is a Seed" the Rev. Alexander Jones traces the implications of Revelation through the Old and New Testaments. The mysterious people of Israel and the genius of Biblical thought are studied by Mgr. Charles Journet and Quentin Lauer, S.J. Michelangelo as the painter of the sybils and prophets is shown to reveal the nature of the prophets as intermediaries between God and man.

Nor does *The Bridge* shrink from approaching controversial and even painful subjects such as the Dreyfus Case, Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and literary figures such as Shylock (Volume I) or Chaucer's Prioress, whose uncharitable anti-Semitic tale fits so ill with her religious vocation. Gems of the Jewish liturgy, such as The Blessings of the Jewish Prayer Book or a meditation on The Beasts and the Everlasting Love by a recently deceased

Jewish author, shed a new light on Jewish religious thought. The whole is rounded by reviews of books of pertinent interest: *The Messianic Idea in Israel* by Joseph Klausner, *An Autobiography* by Jacob Epstein, and others. Well chosen illustrations add to the attraction of the book, which addresses itself to the educated reader without claiming to offer scholarship of the highest level in all its parts. The question arises whether so one-sided a publication, in which "one party speaks but indirectly" can be styled a dialogue. The answer is given in the words of the editor: "We think it can. Wherever the 'other' is met not as an object but as a 'thou,' a living and loved being, there is dialogue. Again, to serve a dialogue is something deeper and more fruitful than to enter into a discussion." The answer is also given in the appreciation of Jewish scholars as distinguished as the late Rabbi Leo Baeck.

IRENE MARINOFF

*The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaean-Christian Studies*. Vol. II. Edited by John M. Oesterreicher. Pantheon Books. \$3.95.

### SOCIOLOGY

In this symposium modern scholars trace evidence of both continuity and change in sociological theory since the 1914-1918 war. This is primarily a work for students, with the main emphasis placed on studies in the United States; but because of its range it acquires importance for all who are concerned about man and society. The work is divided into five parts. In the first, Alvin Boskoff writes about sociology in an introductory way. He says that most people tend to think of this science vaguely, failing to appreciate its basic distinctiveness or to be aware of its developmental nature. He asks how modern sociology is related to the general effort to understand human knowledge and problems, thus opening the way for eight essays on the major features in theory and methodology, seven on various specializations including the sociology of religion, knowledge, law, literature and art.

The fourth section has a wider scope and interest because it deals with the way in which sociology is bound up with other studies. Adolph S. Tomars of the City College of New York says, regarding the various other disciplines, that sociologists now tend to work as a team; and that such a trend of co-operativeness causes "one to wonder if ultimately the practice of individual investigations by the single scholar may not come to be looked upon with suspicion as a kind of solitary vice if not evidence of subversion." That kind of observation will cause the liberal-minded person to speculate as to whether there is an inherent political "safety" in the working of the controlled group.

C. W. M. Hart writes on cultural anthropology and sociology; Kimball Young and Lincoln Freeman explore the field of social psychology, and Gisela J. Hinkle is concerned with the way in which the findings of psycho-analysis have affected sociology. The last section of this carefully planned book is designed to give a picture of sociological research and theory in Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Japan. The article on Britain is contributed by W. J. H. Sprott of Nottingham University. In a balanced summary he draws a necessary distinction between "theoretical" and "applied" sociologists. After giving an account of the work of such men as L. T. Hobhouse, T. H. Marshall, Patrick Geddes and Morris Ginsberg, Mr. Sprott points out that there is but one chair of sociology in Britain—at the London School of Economics; and he says that sociology is an accepted part of the establishment of every university in Britain, except that of Cambridge. He believes that while sociology in its applied form is very much on the cultural map in Britain, sociological theory is neglected. Sociology is emerging as a kind of grammar of social science, but it will not supersede other functions, nor enable those in a hurry to acquire quick answers to questions about man and his situation. In the words of Alvin Boskoff, true sociology will "disappoint the disturbed multitudes

seeking ready answers delivered with certainty" and annoy all who distrust freedom of interpretation.

E. W. MARTIN

*Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*. Edited by Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff. The Dryden Press, New York. \$6.50.

### JOWETT

Both Kipling and Keats have a poem on the theme of the disillusioned lover and there is all the difference between dark and light in their treatment of it. The former deals with the situation as a completely detached and external reporter and, to the end, the lover remains obstinately objective and factual to "a rag and a bone and a hank of hair" as though Kipling were almost deliberately trying to accentuate the sense of detachment for the reader. What worlds away is Keats' "*La Belle Dame sans Merci*"! His magic makes us see the situation through the eyes of the forsaken man, and to feel it as poignantly as he felt it. Willy-nilly, the reader is himself involved in it. That same distinction holds equally true in the realm of biography; there are some which to the end are factual, detached, objective, evoking no vivid response from the reader; others by their imaginative insight engage us to the full.

It is to the second order that this life of Jowett belongs; not since the publication of Lord David Cecil's *The Stricken Deer* have we had a biography so intimately perceptive of its subject or so subtly aware of the delicate nuances of personality. In a word here is biography practised as a true art. This portrait of the famous Master of Balliol is alive, and what is more, so is the background to his life. We are made to feel the pulse of the nation's quickening tempo as a whole with the same vividness that we sense in the descriptions of the university of his day, or in the theological reawakening that meant for Jowett such bitterness of opposition and frustration. The story of the long, slow climb from poverty to the final achievement of the Mastership of his college, with the alternations between great hopes and equally great disappointments, has all the qualities of pure drama; and so has the account of the controversy roused by his participation in the famous "Essays and Reviews." These all breathe and move in the three-dimensional perspective of real life.

The magnitude of Sir Geoffrey Faber's achievement is seen best, however, in his portrait as a whole and in his answer to his own question: "Was Jowett a really great man?" A Greek scholar with at least one masterly translation which has captured the very essence of Plato, an inspiring teacher with a capacity for awaking intellectual keenness and the faculty for hard work in his students, a notable administrator of both his own college and of the university, an exponent of Christianity in terms of moral realities—that he was all these is abundantly clear and by any account his stature is not inconsiderable, but, was he "great" in the true sense of that much-abused adjective? To that question Sir Geoffrey Faber would, one imagines, answer "All but." Jowett learned that the rough waters of theological controversy were bitter indeed, and from them he retired to the less troubled waters of pure scholarship. It was prudent indeed, but prudence is not the mark of the truly great. This review ends as it began. Here is not only the portrait of a leader prophetic of an age to follow, but a moving picture of a whole period.

B. C. PLOWRIGHT

*Jowett*. By Geoffrey Faber. Faber and Faber. 30s.

### THE TRADITION OF LOCKE

This is the first detailed biography of Locke, and in writing it Maurice Cranston has had access to a great deal of new material. His book is conscientious and competent, and will undoubtedly be an indispensable work of reference for students. Yet it is a quiet book and one wonders to what extent

its comparative lack of stirring qualities is due to the limitations of Locke himself, whether in fact his reputation does not far exceed his actual stature, both as a man and a thinker. His temper and aims were modest, yet the Revolution to whose success he contributed so much, if its aims also were moderate, proved to be the most successful and beneficial of all revolutions. Tired of civil war and religious strife, the main body of informed opinion eagerly accepted Locke's views on toleration and government, which seemed to be based on common sense and to be obviously right. Also the Royal Society had recently been founded, and thinking men were ready for Locke's attack on scholasticism and the doctrine of essence, and for his empirical approach to philosophy. Locke deserves every credit for his systematic exposition of the ideas for which the age was ripe, yet perhaps his success owed as much to the ripeness of the time as to the originality and greatness of his achievement. If, indeed, one judges him in terms of success, his achievement was sensational. His *Two Treatises of Government* were not written till 1681, and his *Letters on Toleration* some years later, while their publication in England was not till 1690. Yet they were foundation of the "glorious Resolution" of 1688, the basic innovations of which were permanent, and were not only the foundation of British prosperity for the next two centuries but were an inspiration to other countries, notably France and America.

Locke's influence on philosophy was not less remarkable. His commonsense empiricism has been the basis of the characteristic British tradition in philosophy, and has gained a new triumph in the virtual supremacy of logical analysis in British philosophy in our time. It prefers to take its problems piecemeal, to solve them one at a time. It draws modest conclusions from a survey of many facts instead of elaborating a pretentious system or over-all synthesis (usually shoddy) on a pinpoint of logical theory. Mr. Cranston identifies himself with British logical orthodoxy in his acceptance of the greatness of Locke's philosophical achievement; he quotes Ryle's tribute to Locke that "the questions which he set us asking are the questions which, as we have to recognize, still retain their central position in philosophy."

I feel reluctant to strike a discordant note. Yet an occasional word of protest should be raised against British philosophical orthodoxy; there should be a recognition that there are other modes of philosophizing than those that are fashionable in this small island. The reign of Locke in England has lasted long, but that of scholasticism was longer, and perhaps a reversal of the prevailing trend is now overdue. What we have been witnessing here, in the field of social life as in that of thought, has been an implicit faith in the analytical method, a belief that problems must be solved independently of each other, a distrust of the *Weltanschauung*, of the over-all synthesis. Let us admit that in science analysis necessarily prevails. The same is not true in the field of ethics or of social life. Science cannot provide us with life aims, nor can it provide societies with that agreement on common ends and ideals which alone can ensure that science itself is put to right uses.

The problem of creating a universal civilization in our time cannot be solved without agreement on the principles and ideals needed for the integration of personalities and the adjustment of relationships within and between human societies. For this we need, not analysis, but synthesis, or analysis used as a tool in the creation of a synthesis. For this we need also a new kind of philosophy for which we must look to the new existentialist philosophies rather than to logical analysis, which in any case seems to be reaching a dead end. I suggest that it may well be this new type of integrative thinking rather than the tradition of Locke which points the way to the philosophical future.

J. B. COATES

*John Locke: A Biography*. By Maurice Cranston. Longmans. 42s.

## ON BIRDS AND BEASTS

The title suggests that Miss Stuart has forsaken her usual human interest. This is not so, and the very first pages reveal how closely knit together is man's world with that of his feathered and animal friends. All her birds and beasts have literary, historical or legendary association which has the added interest of showing men and women of illustrious reputation in a more intimate guise. Horace Walpole we see as a tamer of Madame du Deffand's spoilt little dog, to whom he later on gave a home. Pigs, dogs, and even hens would follow Sir Walter Scott. Byron is left disconsolate when his Newfoundland "Boatswain" died, "he who possessed all the virtues of Man without his vices." No cats appear in these pages, but a book about them is provisionally promised by the author. The book teems with information, from the sacred *Ibis* of ancient Greece to Copenhagen, the famous charger which carried Wellington at Waterloo, and in a less military capacity was ridden, one day, in Paris by Lady Shelley.

Miss Stuart says in her note to the reader: "This book is neither scrapbook nor an anthology. . . . It contains my personal choice of birds, dogs and horses in legend, in literature and in history, with little excursions into heraldry and folklore by the way." We might add that only one devoted to history could have written this book; and these excursions certainly add to its variety and interest. There are birds of the ancient world, birds medieval, of the English Renaissance, of Stuart, Augustan and Victorian times; in fact all the birds that have inspired poets, have sung and even talked are here (save the poor little hunted wren of St. Stephen's Day). Most had character and some wisdom, for certain birds are uncanny in their behaviour. For instance, Miss Stuart tells of a sagacious and magnificent macaw that lived in Sir Joshua Reynolds' house in Leicester Square which was "popular with the female sitters but not with the housemaid," whose duty it was to clean out the cage, and whose portrait Sir Joshua's pupil, James Northcote, painted. The parrot, on seeing the portrait of his enemy, attacked it with rage. Burke, Johnson and Garrick were entertained with a proof of this remarkable exhibition, for the success of the experiment never failed. When shown other portraits the macaw took no notice.

Dogs are treated as generously, ranging from the ancient world to Victorian friends. So much that belongs to the human world is woven into these pages. The story of the little dog belonging to Mary Queen of Scots, found crouching in the folds of her robe after the executioner had done his foul work, leads on to the vivid, if unflattering, picture of the unhappy queen as described by Richard Wingfield; "of stature tall, of body corpulent, round shouldered, her face flat and broade, double chinned and hazell-eyed, her borrowed haire auburne." Miss Stuart explains the pronunciation of Caius College, Cambridge; a little treatise on the care of dogs in England was written in Latin by a certain Dr. Keyes, who wished that his name should be immortalized in Latin in founding the college. The material for this fascinating book must have been gathered over the years. The approach to the animal world is unique and the book should appeal to a wide public. It is further enhanced by many illustrations.

THEODORA ROSCOE

*A Book of Birds and Beasts.* By Dorothy Margaret Stuart. Methuen. 30s.

## THE FRENCH NOVEL

*The Unheroic Hero* and *An Age of Fiction* seem to offer between them almost a survey of the French novel for the last 130 years. The first is something of a disappointment. The three authors under consideration—Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert—are seen to reflect in their heroes the scorn and envy typifying their own ambivalent attitude towards the bourgeois. This calls forth a many-

paged review of the treatment of the bourgeois by French writers from the twelfth century onwards, together with an account of changes in the reading public since the Revolution and in practices of publishers during the early nineteenth century. The theme—a very interesting one—which purports to be the role played by anti-bourgeois sentiment "in the creation and complication of the novel and its hero in modern times" becomes submerged. Mr. Giraud's work on the three novelists is uneven, his thought in the Stendhal section is jolty; references to Julien Sorel are incidental, and there is no allusion to Fabrice del Dongo until a sudden mention in the chapter on Balzac. The study of Flaubert is by far the most arresting, although even there we have to swallow a mixture of critics and writers before reaching the examination of *L'Education Sentimentale* which Mr. Giraud takes as his central text. He is at his best when analysing texts. The last chapter "From Bourgeois to Mass-Man," bringing the theme forward into the present century, "the American century," is rendered unpalatable by its moralizing tone and one wonders why it was included. The book as a whole is a mixed bag.

*An Age of Fiction*, a very pleasantly written work on the twentieth century French novel, has a wide appeal; no reader will turn from it without pleasurable enrichment and those who already know something of the subject will have the added satisfaction of a little personal grousing. The section on Aragon, for instance, is impatiently biassed, a section on Colette is strangely absent—a particularly obvious omission—and not all readers will be ready to agree that Martin du Gard's characters are "human and endearing." Especially rewarding however are the chapters on Gide and Proust, on both of whom Mlle. Brée has written before. In the case of Proust it is pleasing to find as it were answers to queries outstanding from her last book. To marshal the work of 21 novelists is no mean undertaking; they are divided into groups: those concerned with the individual's relations to society, those dealing with the inner world of characters little influenced by contemporary events, the Surrealists, affected to their detriment by the doctrines pertaining to poetry, and so on. The method adopted is to recount enough of each author's life to facilitate understanding of his material and standpoint, then to analyse some novels in order to indicate the development of his art. Novelists are discussed in terms of their own time and of ours—Romains and Duhamel, for instance, representing the facile optimism of the early twentieth century, are now severely dated. The book appears as a joint work with Mrs. Guiton; the unexplained division of labour remains an intriguing speculation.

VERA J. DANIEL

*The Unheroic Hero* in the novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert. By Raymond Giraud. Rutgers University Press. \$5.00.

*An Age of Fiction. The French Novel from Gide to Camus*. By Germaine Brée and Margaret Guiton. Rutgers University Press. \$5.00.

#### COLLECTIONS AND REVISIONS

*Russia, the Atom, and the West* (Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.) provides the opportunity for all who were impressed by the level-headed and constructive approach of the 1957 BBC Reith Lectures to see it magnificently staying the course of the printed page. In a world of rubbishy journalism about the Soviet Union, George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, has the still small voice to be heard above the clamour. Because of the urgency of the subject, "Strengthening NATO: to what End?" became the sixth address in place of "Anglo-American Relations" which is now published. In thoughtfulness, good nature, commonsense and acuteness of analysis this is equal to its predecessors, and is a check to the popular British reproof of Americans: "It is for your behaviour collectively, not as individuals, that you are most unpopular."

*The Commonwealth Relations Office List 1958* (H.M. Stationery Office, 21s.), as with the other six editions, brings together in handy form the information essential to the reference shelves of library, school and university. As well as the lists and biographical notes of staffs and organisations and of the meetings of many Prime Ministers, there is a section on the Commonwealth idea, and another on the manuscripts, paintings and books of the India Office library. The third part of the volume is devoted to the constitutional development of the countries within the family, wherein Ghana and the Federation of Malaya claim their recent place.

*Africa in Transition* (Max Reinhardt, 15s.) is edited by Prudence Smith, who travelled in the territories from Belgian Congo to Cape in search of BBC programmes that would reflect light from the research and long experience of those who live and work in these countries. The result was 51 broadcasts by social scientists, from which were chosen a selection dealing with the effect of European influence on the peoples of the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias. The studies demonstrate how wide and various are the implications of "race relations" and Lord Hailey's Preface "Government in a Changing Africa" pinpoints the hopes, the fears, and the dangers, as the African himself begins his role in the developing drama of his continent. Ancient and modern are graphically stated by the dust jacket's artist, Gwyneth Mamlok.

*World Crisis and the Catholic* (Sheed and Ward, 12s. 6d.) is "a declaration by 21 people who are not 'angry'" headed by Konrad Adenauer on the occasion of Rome's second world congress for the Lay Apostolate. Bearing witness are representatives of science, technology and art, whose diversity in whatever race, culture, language or profession, is united in the Roman Catholic Church.

*Uruguay* (Oxford University Press, 15s.), the second edition of George Pendle's packed little historical, social, cultural and economic survey, is expanded to include the latest developments noted during his further visit to "South America's first Welfare State." Maps, physical and political, statistical appendices and a comprehensive bibliography round the presentation of an engaging republic, young in orderly and progressive government, which retains "something of the gaucho's breezy recklessness and audacity."

*World Political Geography* (Constable, 54s.) is under the general editorship of G. Etzel Pearcy, Geographic Attaché of the U.S. Foreign Service, with N. Marbury Efimenco of the University of Michigan as political editor, and 27 other expert authors. They have produced the 38 chapters of this exhaustive second edition, the product of extensive revision. For in the intervening 10 years the changing scene has required drastic evaluation to enable the student to resolve the bewilderments and unravel some of the complexities. Whether the range is local, regional or global, the more than 100 maps are careful coadjutors.

*Britain* (H.M. Stationery Office, 21s.) is an official handbook prepared by the Central Office of Information. Each year the revised edition takes account of trends and progress in government and administration, defence, the national economy, industry, transport, communications, labour, finance, trade, social welfare, housing and planning, religion, science, the arts, sound and television broadcasting, and the Press. The maps, diagrams and numerous photographs embellish while they instruct, and the index from Age-distribution to Zebra-crossings seems to be test-proof. This is a volume "designed to present a continuing picture of the pattern of life" that is readable and attractive to handle too.

GRACE BANYARD

"WHOSOEVER shall CALL  
on the name of the Lord shall  
be delivered." (Joel ii. 32)

## THE CALL FOR DIVINE DELIVERANCE

That ALMIGHTY GOD may deliver  
and protect us from the menace of  
**SATANIC EVIL**  
and  
**ANGELIC ERROR**  
now combining in the effort to gain  
**WORLD DOMINION**:  
Use daily 'The Call' (The Prayer)  
in the  
**'WHOSOEVER' LEAFLET**

For information and free copies write to:  
**THE PANACEA SOCIETY**  
**BEDFORD**

**ITTERINGHAM MILL** Vegetarian Guest House offers  
you the perfect holiday. Safe river bathing. Dinghies  
for grown-ups and children. Easy reach Cromer,  
Sheringham and the Broads. Garages, Kennels. Eighteen  
acres. Friendship, fellowship and spiritual discovery—  
**MARY AND DEREK NEVILLE**, Iitteringham Mill, near  
Aylsham, Norfolk. Telephone Sasthorpe 206.

## STUDIES IN ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

Volume I

Demy 8vo.  
Fully illustrated.  
Price 15s. (post 1s.)

### St. Anthony's Press

46/47 Chancery Lane,  
London, W.C.2

**THE CARAVAN OF EAST AND WEST** is  
an international friendship movement with a  
spiritual background. London meeting on  
first Fridays, Kingsley Hotel, Bloomsbury  
Way, W.C.1 at 7 p.m. S.A.E. details—84 St.  
Thomas's Road, Finsbury Park, London,  
N.4.

THE MOST IMPORTANT  
BOOK IN THE WORLD

## THE SECRET DOCTRINE

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

### FOURTH EDITION

A Synthesis of SCIENCE, RELIGION and PHILOSOPHY  
from the occult point of view. Explains the occult source of  
the elements and their relation to Man. Includes details of the  
four prehistoric Continents, and the evolution of Man, pre-  
historic and historic.

In six handsome volumes. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Price £4 14s. 6d. Post-  
age inland 4s. Abroad 8s. 6d. *Theosophical Catalogue Free*

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE LTD  
68 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

## TYPEWRITERS !

ADDING, BOOK-KEEPING  
AND CALCULATING MACHINES

74 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2

New and Rebuilt  
HIRE AND REPAIRS

**TAYLORS** HOLBORN  
3793

## THE WORLD TODAY — Chatham House Review

To be well informed, you need the facts. In **THE WORLD TODAY** recognized experts bring to the general reader up-to-date and reliable information on current world problems. Factual and objective, **THE WORLD TODAY** also focuses on internal political and economic conditions abroad, in order to provide a background to events of international significance.

The *April* issue includes articles on the new Middle East Oil Agreements, Italy and the Common Market, and Belgium and the International Exhibition.

Back numbers can be obtained from the Oxford University Press, Press Road, Neasden, London, N.W.10. Single copy price 2s. 6d.

To: Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4.

Please enter my subscription to **THE WORLD TODAY** for one year (price 30s.; U.S. and Canada, \$4.80, including postage inland and overseas).  Cheque/  
P.O. enclosed.  Please send invoice.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

*For informed, authoritative comment on  
International Affairs read*

## THE BRITISH SURVEY

*published monthly for over 18 years*

### RECENT ISSUES—

‘Russia and the Atom’

‘Arab Nationalism’

‘Tibet; India’s Economic Problems’

‘Rumania’

Price 1s. 6d. (Main Series); 8d. (Popular Series) from  
THE BRITISH SURVEY, Benjamin Franklin House, 36 Craven  
Street, London, W.C.2